

SEP 12 1956

COLGATE ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL
AMBROSE SWASEY LIBRARY
1100 SOUTH GOODMAN STREET
ROCHESTER 7, NEW YORK

Concordia Theological Monthly



S E P T E M B E R • 1 9 5 6

Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, Walter R. Roehrs, 801 De Mun Ave.,
St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER,
RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER,
ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN, WALTER R. ROEHRs,
LEWIS W. SPITZ, LORENZ WUNDERLICH

CONTENTS

FOR SEPTEMBER 1956

	PAGE
GALATIANS—A DECLARATION OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY <i>William F. Arndt</i>	673
THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE. <i>Norman Nagel</i>	693
HOMILETICS	707
BRIEF STUDIES	721
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	727
BOOK REVIEW	733

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXVII

SEPTEMBER 1956

No. 9

Galatians — A Declaration of Christian Liberty

By WILLIAM F. ARNDT

IT is not difficult to prove that one great topic of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians is Christian freedom. The word "freedom" is, as it were, written with capital letters across the pages of this brief document. To introduce my topic I can hardly do better than quote Dean F. W. Farrar, who, after describing the tactics of the Judaizers opposing the Apostle, pens this eloquent description of the Letter (*The Life and Work of St. Paul*, Ch. 35):

It was against all this hypocrisy, this retrogression, this cowardice, this mummerly of the outward, this reliance on the mechanical, that Paul used words which were half battles. There should be no further doubt as to what he really meant and taught. He would leap ashore among his enemies, and burn his ships behind him. He would draw the sword against this false gospel, and fling away the scabbard. What Luther did when he nailed his Theses to the door of the Cathedral of Wittenberg, that St. Paul did when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians. It was the manifesto of emancipation. It marked an epoch in history. It was for the early days of Christianity what would have been for Protestantism the Confession of Augsburg and the Protest of Spires combined; but it was these "expressed in dithyrambs, and written in jets of flame"; and it was these largely intermingled with an intense personality and impassioned polemics. It was a De Corona, a Westminster Confession, and an Apologia in one. If we wish to find its nearest parallel in vehemence, effectiveness, and depth of conviction, we must look forward for sixteen centuries, and read Luther's famous treatise, *De Captivitate Babylonica*, in which he realized his saying "that there ought to be set aside for this Popish battle a tongue of which every word is a thunderbolt." To the Churches of Galatia he never came again; but the words scrawled on those few sheets of papyrus, whether they failed or

not of their immediate effect, were to wake echoes which should "roll from soul to soul, and live for ever and for ever."

As a manifesto, or declaration, of Christian freedom let us, then, view Galatians in this article.

I

For our orientation it will be advisable briefly to survey the passages in which the word "freedom" or "free" occurs. It is early in the Epistle that Paul first touches on this topic (2:3-5). In the historical sketch of his career he relates what happened when he and Barnabas, accompanied by Titus, went to Jerusalem. They held conferences with the apostles in that city and described the work they had done in Gentile territory. The visit, as far as Paul's account permits us to judge, was a pleasant occasion — except for one factor. There were false brethren in Jerusalem who used dishonorable tactics in opposing the message that Paul preached. Though they had not been invited to attend the conferences, they, like spies, wormed their way into some of these meetings, intent on discovering how far the freedom from the Law which Paul preached extended. That he stood at least for a certain amount of freedom was evident because he had with him an uncircumcised person, Titus, and evidently did not consider the friendly, brotherly contact with him polluting. What other forms of liberty did he allow? That was the thing they wished to know in order to be able to oppose him effectively. Paul says he did not yield to these false brethren for a minute. The meaning of the passage for his message of freedom will have to be adverted to again later.

A passage where the word "free" is used is the famous typological exposition of the story of Hagar and Sarah (4:21-31). Sarah, the free woman, is the type of the new Jerusalem, the Christian Church. We believers of the NT are her children; hence we, too, have freedom. So runs the argument.

In 5:1 comes the clarion call which contains the conclusion of the discussion: For liberty Christ has made us free; stand, then, firm and do not again become subject to the yoke of slavery.

In the practical section the possession of liberty is again asserted, but at once the appropriate warning is added: You are called for liberty, brethren; but do not consider liberty as a pretext for service of the flesh (5:13). While the passages enumerated are not

many, they are clear, and the thought expressed in them is found in numerous other statements which will have to be considered.

II

In studying the message which Paul proclaims it becomes evident to us, even after a superficial reading of the Epistle, that at least one kind of freedom which he has in mind is freedom from the Mosaic Law. The term "Judaizers" has occurred above. The noun does not appear in the NT, but the verb on which the noun is based, *ιουδαίζω*, is found in 2:14 of our letter. It is the only instance in which a NT writer employs it. The context makes it plain that what the verb means is "to live like a Jew," that is, to observe all the rules and regulations to which a loyal Jew of that period submitted himself. In our terminology the term has taken on the additional significance of propagandist for the keeping of these laws. Zacharias and Elizabeth observed the Mosaic Law, but no one would call them Judaizers; they did not engage in attempts to make Gentile people adopt the Jewish way of life. There is another feature which must be mentioned.

As we see from Acts 15 and from our epistle the Judaizers of the apostolic age not only observed the Mosaic ceremonial laws and advocated their keeping, but they were of the opinion that to be members of God's family one had to practice such observance. James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, the Lord's brother, carefully kept the traditional rules of worship and Mosaic prescriptions having to do with purity, but he was not a Judaizer; he did not think that God requires these matters in the NT era. The Judaizers, however, distinctly taught that God demands this observance.

We can easily see how they came to hold such a position. They had been brought up in the belief that the Mosaic Law was divine and that whoever wished to have God's favor had to keep it. This was the view of the apostles themselves until the Holy Spirit, in the Cornelius episode related in Acts 10, led Peter to see that in the period of the new covenant the specific Mosaic ordinances are no longer binding. The Judaizers were like the disciples of John the Baptist and the Pharisees, who criticised the life of freedom from the traditions of the elders led by Jesus and His disciples. Jesus says of the critics (Luke 5:39), explaining their attitude:

"No one having drunk old wine desires new, for he says the old is excellent." The Judaizers were ultraconservative, to use a modern term. They felt at home in their ancestral religious abode and refused to yield to the arguments produced by Peter and his immediate associates as well as later on by Paul and Barnabas. These were based on direct divine revelation and on the OT Scriptures themselves — arguments showing conclusively that the Mosaic legislation was intended by God to have validity merely for the period of the OT.

They indeed could point to a fact which must have appeared impressive to all believers — Jesus, the Son of God, the Messiah, had observed the Mosaic Law, yes, perfectly. If *He* had not refused to travel this much despised road, what right did His followers have to consider themselves exempt from these ordinances? The chief argument on which they relied, however, so one imagines, was the authority and the majesty of the OT Scriptures. "It is written that we must keep the seventh day as the Lord's Sabbath, that we must practice circumcision, that we have to abstain from the eating of pork and of blood! The words are so plainly and largely put on the pages of the sacred rolls that he that runneth may read. We dare not set aside and declare invalid what our sacred Book prescribes." Thus they must have argued. We ourselves have experienced the overwhelming impact of the statement "It is written" when a religious question has to be decided. It is not difficult for us to visualize how invincible the Maginot line of the Judaizers apparently was.

To do them justice, one has to make one more admission. Jesus Himself, the Head of the Church, in the discourses which He had delivered and which His disciples, we can be sure, repeated at every opportunity, had not declared that in the days of the new dispensation the Mosaic Law should be considered abrogated. He had indeed clashed with the Scribes and Pharisees on points of religious observance, but the issues, as we see when we examine them carefully, never had to do with provisions of the Mosaic Law, but with the so-called traditions of the elders, which by the Scribes and Pharisees were placed on a level with, or even above, the commandments contained in the Mosaic code. Cf. Mark 7:8-13. When Jesus was confronted with the charge that His disciples had violated

the Sabbath Law by plucking ears of wheat and separating the grain in them, He had indeed said, "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath Day." But it must be remembered that the "offense" which aroused the ire of the opponents of Jesus was not something the Mosaic Law had forbidden but a matter classed as sinful by the unjustified definitions and inferences of the Pharisaic party. Besides, the declaration that the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath Day merely says that He has the *right* to say whether and how the Sabbath is to be observed; the words do not signify that He decrees the Sabbath law is to be considered a dead letter.

I am aware that at times it is asserted that in one sole passage (Mark 7:14f.), in His statement about the nonpolluting character of foods, Jesus virtually declares the Mosaic food regulations null and void. Cf. *Interpreter's Bible*, ad loc. That interpretation cannot be held. He merely asserts that considered objectively and physiologically foods cannot produce a state of impurity. The question in debate was whether the partaking of food that had been handled with unwashed hands rendered one ceremonially unclean, and the point of discussion was not whether the old Mosaic distinctions between animals that may, and those that may not, be eaten, were still in force. It must, then, be considered established that Jesus nowhere in the words handed down to us makes a statement to the effect that in the coming era the Mosaic code with its many regulations should no longer be in force. The remark of Mark 7:19b, "cleansing all foods," said with reference to Jesus and His statement, must in the light of the context simply mean that our Lord opposed the idea that foods can by themselves make a person impure.

That the position of the Judaizers, however, was totally erroneous had become evident through the revelation granted Peter, referred to above, in which the Holy Spirit taught that contact with uncircumcised people is not sinful, that if they believe in Christ, they are to be baptized even if they have not received circumcision, and that the gift of the Spirit will come upon them as well as upon everybody else who accepts Jesus as his Lord and Savior. While the prohibition forbidding entering the house of a Gentile and having table fellowship with him belonged to the traditions of the elders, the law of circumcision was contained in the Scriptures them-

selves and had to be acknowledged as divine. The insight that came to Peter was hailed with joy by his brethren when he returned to Jerusalem, and in reply to anxious questions he related in detail the events in Joppa and Caesarea, which convinced him that Baptism and brotherly contact should not be withheld from uncircumcised believers. Acts 11:18 states: "When they [that is, the critics] heard these things, they became quiet and praised God, saying: So, then, God has given to the Gentiles also repentance for life." All this seems to have happened early in the history of Christianity, perhaps in A. D. 32 or 33, shortly after the conversion of Paul.¹

In the years that followed, the apostles who remained in Jerusalem had scarcely any occasion of applying the new instruction with respect to the Gentiles. They were fully occupied, so we may conclude, with evangelistic work in Jewish communities located in Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. Cf. Acts 9:31.

Events outside Palestine that followed were confirmatory of the truth that freedom from the Mosaic ceremonial regulations had now been decreed by the Lord. Some Cyprian and Cyrenean Christians who had fled from Jerusalem in the persecution that burst upon the church after the murder of Stephen had come to Antioch in Syria, and there they did regularly what Peter had done in an isolated instance—they preached the Gospel to non-Jews, in this instance Hellenes, that is, to real Greeks, who were uncircumcised people. Their efforts were abundantly blessed; a large congregation was founded. The matter created some stir in Jerusalem, and in order to prevent a wrong course from being pursued, the mother church sent Barnabas, a thoroughly qualified teacher, who himself hailed from the island of Cyprus, to Antioch as a guide and adviser. When he arrived, he found the Antiochian Christians following the principle that circumcision and the keeping of the old ceremonial and ritual laws no longer were required for membership in the family of God. What was his reaction? He did not insist

¹ One naturally asks whether the conversion and Baptism of the Ethiopian official, related Acts 8:26ff., did not show the apostles that the old Mosaic Laws were set aside? The reply is that we do not know whether the apostles were made aware of the evangelist Philip's contact with this man; furthermore, that it is possible, although hardly probable, that this stranger was circumcised and that hence the respective separatistic regulations of the traditions of the elders did not apply to him.

that the Mosaic code be followed. Rejoicing over what had been accomplished, he admonished the members of the church to cling to the Lord with their heart's determination (Acts 11:23).

But while freedom from the Mosaic Law was proclaimed in Antioch and received what we have to regard as divine sanction, a number of people of Jewish descent in Jerusalem and probably elsewhere held the opinion that this freedom was a fiction, that the Mosaic Law was still in force, and that to belong to God's people one had to practice circumcision. The first time this issue had arisen the narrow, legalistic views had, as related above, been successfully squelched. Cf. Acts 11:18. But a number of years later they were advocated again. Acts 15 informs us how people holding such convictions came from Judea to Antioch, set forth their opinions, and caused great unrest in the church.

It may strike us as strange that in congregations which were guided by the apostles there could grow up such a Judaizing party, holding views which were altogether at variance with the convictions of the inspired leaders. Several things must not be overlooked. In Palestine, where the apostles themselves were active, the question whether everybody who wished to be a disciple of Jesus had to be circumcised was not an issue. The people that were brought into the church all were Jews by birth and hence approved of circumcision. There were Grecians in the Christian community at Jerusalem, to use the term of the AV, whom the original Greek text calls Hellenists and who must carefully be distinguished from Hellenes, that is, real Greeks. The Grecians, or Hellenists, were Jews who spoke Greek as their vernacular. It was the language that marked them off from the so-called Hebrews in the early Christian Church, referred to Acts 6:1, who spoke the paternal Aramaic. Hence among the Christian people of Palestine, whether they were Hebrews or Hellenists, the question pertaining to the continuing validity of the circumcision law was not debated. This validity simply was taken for granted. The old rite was practiced universally. Another factor that comes into consideration was that the apostles themselves loyally observed all the regulations of the Mosaic code. They knew, it is true, that Christians did not have to take this course, but they likewise knew that it was not wrong to observe it. And since they had followed it from infancy, they

joyfully adhered to this mode of worship, being aware that in this matter they were dealing with an adiaphoron. Their example, of course, could not fail to confirm the Palestinian Christians in the desire to continue as much as possible in the paths traveled by their fathers.

Were not the apostles, then, so someone may ask, remiss in their duty when they omitted this particular Christian truth, that of freedom from the Mosaic code, in their preaching and instruction? But did they really omit it? I am of the belief, though I cannot prove it historically, that they did not remain silent on this point. The accusation brought against the first martyr Stephen (Acts 6:14), though it presented his teaching in a garbled and one-sided form, is evidence that freedom from the regulations of the old covenant was not an unknown topic in Palestine. But I am likewise of the opinion that the apostles did not emphasize this topic and by no means encouraged their Palestinian fellow Christians to think of availing themselves of such freedom; that they rather, whenever their advice was requested, urged that the old modes of life and worship be continued. To the Jews about them it would have been a terrible offense to see the followers of Jesus flout, let us say, the old Sabbath law; this at once would have characterized them in the eyes of their countrymen as enemies of the true God, as pagans in disguise. There were more important things to do than to assert Christian freedom by superheroic measures when it was not wrong to pursue the old ways. What was essential was the preaching of Christ's death with its blessed meaning and of His glorious resurrection. For that reason the matter of freedom from compliance with the old Mosaic Law was not put into the foreground.²

² If anybody would like to pursue this subject from the point of view of psychology, let him think of the power of sentiment. The late Henry Cabot Lodge, Senator of Massachusetts, in a speech at Faneuil Hall, Boston, when he addressed both Union and Confederate veterans, said (I quote from memory) "It is sentiment that rules the world. It was sentiment that fought the (Civil) war, it is sentiment that has re-united us." The power of sentiment was to be seen in the converts from Judaism in Palestine. The old ancestral ways had become dear to them. The words of Jesus quoted Luke 5:39, adverted to above, apply here also. We must not forget that sentiment often is wrong, as it was in the case of the Judaizers. But how foolish if we forget its power and think that mankind is moved and guided by sound, rational considerations and arguments!

That the position of the Judaizers was entirely wrong was confirmed when Paul, Barnabas, and Titus came to Jerusalem as related Gal. 2:1 ff. In my opinion this visit must be identified with the so-called famine visit of Paul and Barnabas of which we are told Acts 11:30 and 12:25. (Others think the Gal. 2:1 ff. visit is the one described in detail Acts 15:2 ff., which took the missionaries to the Apostolic Council.) Everybody could see that Paul fully agreed with Barnabas and the Christians in Antioch in their attitude toward the old Mosaic Law. There have been exegetes who have interpreted the difficult passage Gal. 2:3-5 as saying that Paul yielded and saw to it that Titus was circumcised. But this view does not agree with the context. On the contrary, we must hold that Paul stoutly upheld the principle of freedom from the old Mosaic yoke.³

Titus was not compelled to undergo circumcision; the apostles in Jerusalem did not insist that this rite be performed. It was as strong evidence as a person could desire that both Paul himself considered compliance with the old code unnecessary and that the leaders of the church in Jerusalem fully approved of his position. This position was directly and definitely confirmed when the hand of fellowship was given to Paul and Barnabas by the fellow apostles and no addition to their message was suggested. Cf. Gal. 2:7-10. There could be no doubt that Christ, the Head of the Church, had through the inspired teachers revealed that the keeping of the Mosaic Ceremonial Law no longer was required.

Not long afterwards occurred the painful scene in Antioch when Paul had to reprimand Peter, who after granting the uncircumcised Christians the full status of brethren began to waver and withdrew from intercourse with them, apparently bowing to the criticism of certain Jewish Christians. Here again the cause of freedom triumphed because Paul in an open meeting took Peter to task for

³ Vv. 4 and 5 have been differently translated. Schlier's rendering in his commentary on Galatians in the Meyer series strikes me as satisfactory. Assuming that we have here an anacoluthon, he translates: On account of the false brethren who had recently been brought in [that is into the church] and who had surreptitiously entered to spy out the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus in order to put us into bondage—to them we did not yield for one minute in order that the truth of the Gospel might remain your possession.

a wrong reactionary step, and we have every reason to believe that the consternation caused by Peter's momentary lapse into wrong conduct was dispersed and that the leader acknowledged his error and mended his ways. Cf. Gal. 2:11-16.

The evidence, then, that the Mosaic Law no longer was binding was simply overwhelming. But certain Judaizers, unwilling to accept this teaching, entered the Galatian congregations with their false propaganda and were remarkably successful. The new Galatian converts were led astray and began to give their consent to the skillfully presented arguments of the reactionaries. That they yielded a good deal of ground is shown by their observance of days and seasons, insisted on by the intruders. Cf. Gal. 4:10. That many of them had already submitted to circumcision may be doubted. One gets the impression that the errorists were hard at work to bring about acceptance of this rite and were listened to with respect and some approval, but that at least the majority of the Galatian Christians had not yet fully surrendered to these propagandists. It is at this juncture that Paul girds his loins and in the spirit of God gives battle to the opponents, writing this superb epistle.

How does he prove his thesis that the Mosaic Ceremonial Law no longer has binding force? One of the chief considerations he submits is that the Mosaic code was meant to be only temporary. This truth is set forth in 3:19: "What, then, of the Law? It was added for the sake of transgressions *until* the Seed should come to whom the promise had been given," etc. He had said a few verses before that the Seed is Christ. Now he says, the Law was intended to be in force "until the Seed should come." Elucidating this matter further, he says that "before the coming of faith we were all prisoners under Law, shut up for the faith which was to be revealed" (3:23). The Law served as a house of detention, guarding, restricting, restraining. Using another picture, he calls the Law our παιδαγωγός, a slave or servant who had to take the boys to school and see that they behaved on the way as well as at home. This παιδαγωγός had the function to take men to Christ, preparing them for the joyous age of freedom through imposing burdens and severe prohibitions. Now that the Gospel had come,

this παιδαγωγός no longer is needed. Cf. 3:24f. If anybody says that these are all assertions and that no proof is contained in them (except such as is contained in every divine pronouncement), we have to say that Paul knows this very well, and hence he does bring in real evidence, the statement of 3:26-29: the Galatian Christians who did not have the Ceremonial Law nevertheless have become children of God. In Baptism they have put on Christ. They form one group with the believers who were born as Israelites. There you have the proof that the Mosaic Ceremonial Law no longer is binding. People have actually become heirs of the promise without the Ceremonial Law.

To make this meaning perfectly clear Paul uses the illustration of a minor who, though he owns everything, nevertheless has not the use of his property until the time limit has been reached which the father has fixed (4:1-5); the minor is under stewards or overseers. This condition is not to be permanent; it is a temporary (and admittedly salutary) arrangement. So it was with the believers in the days of the old covenant; their Law was to be of limited duration. But in God's own time came the glorious hour when He sent His Son as our Substitute, who redeemed us from the Law. It was the hour of freedom that had struck; the condition of subordination under the overseers ceased. And that this blessed condition has arrived Paul again proves by what the Galatian believers, who did not have the Ceremonial Law, had experienced. God had sent the Spirit of His Son into their hearts as well as into the hearts of Jewish Christians, the Spirit that cries, Abba, Father. Here Paul's position has a strong, indestructible foundation.

In order not to make this article too long, I shall merely point to one more argument of Paul's showing that the old Mosaic laws no longer were in force. As he usually does when arguing a point of divine truth, he here, too, goes to the inspired Old Testament Scriptures for instruction and proof. He submits the famous typological discussion having to do with Hagar and Sarah (4:21-31). These two women, he says, were meant by God to teach us something concerning the old covenant, that of the Law, and the new one, that of the Gospel promise. That Hagar represents, as it were, the Law is confirmed by the fact that the word "Hagar" in Arabia

means rock, which significantly points to Mount Sinai.⁴ Sarah, on the other hand, the free woman, represents the covenant of freedom. And what does the story, typologically considered, tell us? Hagar was expelled, which circumstance shows that the covenant of the Mosaic Law was not to abide; it will be, in fact it has been, terminated. Thus the OT Scriptures themselves refer to the transitional character of the Mosaic legislation. We have to admit that if it were not for Paul's inspired interpretation, we should hardly have found such a typological significance in the story of these two women, but Paul was led by the Spirit to understand it as presenting this prophetic lesson.

What fervent thanks we owe God for sending Paul with his message of freedom from the Mosaic regulations! If such a kerygma had not been proclaimed then, humanly speaking, Christianity would have become a little Jewish sect, with headquarters in Jerusalem or Galilee, and by and by it would have been absorbed by Judaism or in some other way have become extinct. Christianity could not have fulfilled its destiny as a divine religion for all mankind if these shackles had not been removed. We may think of the Ebionites, who while professing to be Christians, endeavored to cling to the old Mosaic dispensation and in the course of a few centuries disappeared.

Do we all realize that because freedom from the Mosaic legislation is set forth in the New Testament, the efforts put forth in wide circles of the Reformed churches to make some of the laws in the Mosaic code, e. g., the prohibition of the production of images, binding for us today, are in disagreement with God's will? that the position of the Seventh-Day Adventists reintroducing the keeping of the old Jewish Sabbath is a deplorable departure from the way of freedom which the church is to travel? Even for us, who have breathed the air of liberty from our birth, it is not easy to avoid errors akin to those of the Judiazers. They clung to what was old, traditional, customary, and such an attitude they main-

⁴ The Greek text of v. 25 is much disputed. Some exegetes, on the basis of the reading they adopt, think that Paul is here not concerned with the meaning of the word "Hagar," but with the location of Mount Sinai in Arabia, where the descendants of Hagar were living and with her status as a bond servant, which makes her the representative of the covenant of bondage, that is, of the Law.

tained had divine sanction. We are not always careful enough to distinguish between what is old, venerable, customary, traditional, and what is divinely taught. The course of the iconoclastic innovator has to be deprecated, but likewise the course of the blind traditionalist who holds that because something is old, it must have had a divine origin. In a church body which is growing, expanding, and constantly facing new conditions and issues the warning is certainly apropos that, in evaluating opinions as to the wisest course to pursue in a given situation, the great truth that in Galatians Paul hoisted the flag of freedom must not be overlooked and that such freedom is treated with contempt not only by those who fall back into the very errors of the Judaizers but likewise by those who throttle freedom by traditionalism or a similar wrong course.

A word ought to be added about the way of recognizing what in the OT belongs to the specific Mosaic code. Here the difference between the Lutheran and the Reformed system becomes very apparent. The Reformed say, all the commandments of God contained in the OT must be kept unless there is a declaration of God saying that a certain regulation, like that of circumcision, no longer applies. The Lutherans say no commandment of God in the OT has to be regarded as binding for us unless in the NT (or in the OT by some special means) it is declared to have eternal validity. The giving of the tenth is certainly commanded in the OT, and there is no statement saying that this law has been abrogated. Still we have to say that it is not one of the eternal laws of God, because there is nothing in the NT imposing it as a moral obligation on everybody, nor is there anything in the OT that says we are here dealing with one of the immutable laws concerning right and wrong.

III

But there is another important topic to be looked at when we speak of freedom as proclaimed in Galatians. Paul not only states the truth that the Mosaic ceremonial legislation no longer is valid but also sets forth the principle that we as children of God enjoy freedom from the Law in every respect, not only from the special Mosaic regulations. Here we arrive at a topic which is still more central and vital for our faith than that of our attitude to the OT Ceremonial Law.

It is above everything else this freedom from the Law in general which Luther finds proclaimed by Paul in this manifesto of Christian liberty. In his commentary on Galatians published 1535, he says (to quote merely one passage from dozens of similar tenor) commenting on 2:19:

When the Law accuses you and brings to light your sin, your conscience at once tells you, You have committed transgressions. If you then hold to what Paul here teaches, you can carry on this dialog with your conscience: Yes, it is true, I have sinned. — Hence God will punish and condemn you! — No. — But the Law of God says so! — I have nothing to do with this Law. — How is that? — Because I have another Law which compels the accusing Law to shut up, and this Law is freedom. — What freedom? — That of Christ. For through Christ I have been made free from the Law. For this reason, the Law, which indeed is and remains a Law to the ungodly, is no Law for me, but my Law is freedom. It puts the Law, which condemns me, in bondage. Hence the Law, which formerly bound and kept me imprisoned, is now itself bound and held captive through grace or through freedom, which now is my Law. [St. Louis ed., IX, col. 218 f.]

My intention is not to intimate that Luther did not perceive the fight of Paul against the attempt to force the old Mosaic regulations on the Gentile Christians. He did indeed see this feature of Paul's message. In discussing Gal. 4:3 he says:

Although Paul calls the whole Law elements of the world, as can be seen from what I have been stating, he nevertheless employs this contemptuous language chiefly of the ceremonial laws. These, he says, if they accomplish anything, merely regulate external matters, such as details concerning food, drink, dress, holy sites, seasons, the temple, festivals, washings, sacrifices, etc. These things all belong to this world and were ordained by God merely for the present life and not in order to produce righteousness in the sight of God and salvation. Hence in this expression "elements of the world" he rejects and condemns all righteousness of the Law based on these external ceremonies, although they had been ordained and commanded by God to be observed for a given period; and he applies to them the most derogatory term "elements of the world." [St. Louis ed., IX, col. 478 f.]

But whoever reads Luther on Galatians soon sees that for him the freedom taught by Paul in this letter is freedom from the do-

minion of the *whole* Law, that is, not merely of the Ceremonial but of the Moral Law as well.

This is indeed a bold position to take. Can it be proved that Paul assumed such an attitude? If correctly ascribed to him, it must have appeared extremely radical to many of his contemporaries. It is unintelligible to a large number of Bible readers even today. The study of the Epistle will have to supply the answer.

A good way to start our investigation is to look once more at the position of the Judaizers. Was their characteristic belief merely this, that the old Ceremonial Law had not yet been abrogated? If that had been their sole error, Paul might have dealt more gently with them. We know with what consideration he treats the weak Christians who believed that it was wrong for Christians to eat the meat of animals slain at heathen altars in honor of false gods. Cf. 1 Corinthians 8—10. These people called something sinful that was not sinful. But though they erred, they were humble Christians, and Paul taught that they should be accorded loving treatment. "See to it that your freedom does not become a stumbling block to the weak" (1 Cor. 8:9). Altogether different was the attitude of the Judaizers. Not only were they violent propagandists for their wrong view touching the Mosaic regulations—the very opposite of humble believers in Christ—but they taught the faith-destroying doctrine of justification through good works.

Can this be proved? That such was their teaching is indirectly made evident through the stern language which Paul employs in speaking of their message. Though they undoubtedly called it the Gospel, he declares that it is no Gospel at all (1:6). The curse which he in that connection hurls against those that preached a different Gospel is an indication that what the Judizers were propounding was not only wrong but also positively destructive of faith. When Paul, in speaking of the Antioch scene, discusses the basic issues, it is not freedom from ceremonies that he stresses but the truth that we are justified by faith without the works of the Law (2:16). The same antithesis of faith vs. works of the Law is brought before us when Paul asks the Galatian Christians how they had received the Holy Spirit—was it through works of the Law or through the message of faith (3:2-5)? It is worth noticing that the Greek expression "works of the Law" has no article either

before works or before Law; hence no special kind of law like that of circumcision is referred to, but Law in general, whatever its particular nature might happen to be. In the magnificent argumentation 3:6-14, where Paul with vigorous blows annihilates the position he attacks, what precisely is it that he wields his sword against? It is not adherence to the Ceremonial Law, but the view that righteousness and life might be obtained through doing "Law works." Furthermore, let 5:4 be noted here: "You have been removed from Christ, you who endeavor to be justified by Law, you have fallen from grace." Again it is not *"the Law"* that he speaks of but Law in general. If the position that Paul opposes so forcefully was the position taught the Galatians by the Judaizers—and that we have to assume—then certainly the fundamental error of the opponents was the belief that righteousness can and must be achieved by us through doing good works.

It is chiefly to oppose this heresy which, alas! is as common and widespread as mankind itself, that Paul has entered the arena. And he does it not only by defending with triumphant energy the teaching of justification by grace through faith but also by showing that the Christian is free from the Law, its obligations, its dominion and dictation, and that hence justification cannot come about through performance of works of the Law because the Law has been removed from its throne.

There are several clear, well-known passages which show that this is the position of the Apostle. We first look at the golden words which have instructed and thrilled readers throughout the centuries, 2:19: "For through Law I have died to Law that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ." The Law itself, with its verdict of damnation, had helped to bring about his complete separation from it. It had pronounced curses against him; he said good-by to it, having sought refuge in the wounds of Christ. Could the Apostle have more forcefully expressed the truth that the believer in Christ is free from the Law, which, since the term in the Greek is employed without the article, must mean Law in general and hence include the Moral Law?

Equally definite is the beautiful passage 4:4f.: "When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under (the) Law, to redeem them that were under

(the) Law that we might receive the adoption of sons." It is true that in this connection the Mosaic Law and its temporary validity are discussed. But in speaking of freedom from this Law with its obligations, Paul uses the general term, saying Christ was sent to redeem those that were under the Law. Christ came to bring freedom from the yoke of the Law; those who were bound by the Mosaic code (which included the Moral Law) were free from these fetters; those who were subject merely to the Moral Law were likewise given freedom from this yoke through the work of Christ. When Paul in 5:1 and 13 declares that the Gospel has brought them freedom, it is a comprehensive freedom from the Law that he has in mind.

These words would certainly fill us with awe if we had not heard them many a time. Let us, to be concrete, employ the term *Ten Commandments* instead of *Moral Law*. We are told that we are no longer under the Ten Commandments; that they are not our master any more. This assertion is altogether unacceptable to many people and sounds to them not only bewildering but positively wicked. How can the Moral Law of God, the Ten Commandments, be declared to have lost its authority for the Christians? Are not the Ten Commandments divine? Do we not, through our interpretation, do the very thing of which Jesus accuses the scribes and Pharisees — that through their traditions they render the Word of God without effect? This matter calls for an explanation. The Moral Law of God is indeed divine, and no one can change it. The eternal verities which it expresses will stand in spite of the indifference and disobedience of man. The famous lines of James Russell Lowell here ask for a hearing:

In vain we call old notions fudge
And bend our conscience to our dealing;
The Ten Commandments will not budge
And stealing will continue stealing.

What Paul proclaims when he speaks of freedom from the Law cannot signify that what the Moral Law of God declares sinful no longer is sinful for the Christian, that, for instance, while in the case of people in general the bearing of false witness is a heinous offense, for the Christian it would not be wrong to commit such a thing. That Paul does not wish to impugn the majesty of the

Law is evident from 5:14. "For the whole Law is fulfilled in one word: you shall love your neighbor as yourself." One is amazed to hear the Apostle, who had declared the reign of the Law ended, now suddenly referring to the Law as still existing and as evidently divine and holy. If anybody thinks that St. Paul advocates antinomian views, he totally misunderstands him. Cf. the emphatic statement Rom. 7:12.

But if the Apostle, on the one hand, does not wish to declare the Law abrogated or possibly made more liberal and tolerant, and, on the other, puts freedom from the Law on his banner, what does he mean? One of the most significant points of Paul's theology here comes before us. He teaches that in the Christian the doing of God's will is not accomplished through the Law but through the Holy Spirit. Freedom from the Law in the case of the believers in Christ does not mean lawlessness but that a new force is operating in them, the Spirit of God. What the Law cannot bring about—the joyful performance of God's will—the Spirit, who has taken up His abode in the heart of the Christian, makes a blessed reality. This topic Paul treats 5:13-25. Pondering this passage, we begin to understand the Apostle's teaching on the Law. He is not an enemy of it, but he opposes the thought that it is through the Law that we live as children of God. The righteousness of the Christian's life is not Law righteousness but Spirit righteousness.

IV

Is the Law, then, of any use at all to the Christian? It is indeed. It expresses God's will as to our actions. It states what is right and what is wrong. The Christian, as far as he is a Christian, does not need the direction of the Law on these matters because the Spirit leads him forward in the paths of righteousness. But unfortunately the Christian still is a sinful being; carnal, unworthy, ungodly tendencies still exist in him, the old Adam exerts his influence, and for the flesh (the term which Paul uses) the Law is still needed. In the Formula of Concord, Art. VI, this matter is set forth with power and clarity. A few sentences have to be quoted:

And, indeed, if the believing and elect children of God were completely renewed in this life by the indwelling Spirit, so that in their nature and all its powers they were entirely free from

sin
ei
w
w
as
th
ni
or
ho

ph
al
th
m
m
cl
p
in
be
re
in
bu
T

I
the
not
the

I
hav
deal
min
Thi
sins
of t
that
The
app
our
such

sin, they would need no law and hence no one to drive them either, but they would do of themselves and altogether voluntarily, without any instruction, admonition, urging, or driving of the Law, what they are in duty bound to do according to God's will; just as the sun, the moon, and all the constellations of heaven have their regular course of themselves, unobstructed, without admonition, urging, driving, force, or compulsion; according to the order of God which God once appointed to them, yea, just as the holy angels render an entirely voluntary obedience.

However, believers are not renewed in this life perfectly or completely, *completeive* or *consummative* (as the ancients say); for although their sin is covered by the perfect obedience of Christ so that it is not imputed to believers for condemnation, and also the mortification of the old Adam and the renewal in the spirit of their mind is begun through the Holy Ghost, nevertheless the old Adam clings to them still in their nature and all its internal and external powers. Of this the Apostle has written Rom. 7:18ff.: I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing. . . . Therefore, because of these lusts of the flesh the truly believing, elect, and regenerate children of God need in this life not only the daily instruction and admonition, warning and threatening of the Law, but also frequently punishments. . . . [Thorough Declaration, *Trigl.*, pp.963—965.]

Hence we here are confronted with these amazing paradoxes: the Christian is free from the Law, and he is still under it; he does not need the Law, and he needs it every day; he can joyfully bid the Law adieu, and he has to contemplate it all his life.

It is in keeping with what has just been stated that the Apostle, having told us that we are free from the Law, finally puts a good deal of Law into his discourse, not fearing at all that some little minds will charge him with self-contradiction or inconsistency. Think of the blast in 5:18-21, which, after listing a number of sins that probably had a special fascination for the carnal nature of the Galatian converts, concludes with the stern pronouncement that those doing such things will not inherit the kingdom of God. Then he continues to place a diet of Law before us, but in a very appealing way, enumerating some of the virtues that result from our being filled with the Spirit (5:22f.). And he adds, "against such things there is no Law," that is, when you are engaged in

doing the things indicated, the thunder and lightning of Mount Sinai, great realities though they are, will not touch you.

One more consideration should be mentioned. Owing to a certain timidity in us and an inordinate love of self we ministers are likely to preach this freedom from the Law with less enthusiasm and definiteness than we ought. On the one hand, we are afraid that our speaking on this topic with full boldness might open the floodgates of evil in our hearers and, on account of their misunderstanding of our message, lead them into a life of licentiousness. There come to mind the complaints of the aging Luther about the conduct of the people in Wittenberg. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the preaching of the Law, especially if it is vivid, is listened to gladly by people (cf. Herod finding the preaching of John the Baptist interesting, Mark 6:20); and that, besides, the legalistic way of doing church work is more easy than an evangelical course. How pleasant it is for us to hand out to our parishioners, figuratively speaking, two lists: one headed, things permitted; the other, things not permitted; and then to apply the propositions mechanically in a way that will not cause much loss of sleep. Remember, please, that this is metaphorical terminology which everybody has to translate into language fitting his own case. In view of all this it must be our daily prayer that the Spirit of God, who is to lead our parishioners into paths of righteousness, may fill us, too, and show us, on the one hand, how to preach the sweet message of freedom from the Law with due boldness, and, on the other, keep us from forgetting that in every Christian there is a struggle between the flesh and the spirit and that our language must not become an aid to Satan as he endeavors to take our hearers on the broad way that leads to destruction. St. Augustine in his beautiful work *De doctrina Christiana* writes (4:15): "Et quis facit, ut quod oportet et quemadmodum oportet dicatur a nobis, nisi in cuius manu sunt et nos et sermones nostri?" Yes, indeed, God has to grant us both what to say and how to say it; and let us not forget that He most willingly gives the Holy Spirit to those that ask Him (Luke 11:13).

St. Louis, Mo.

The Authority of Scripture

By NORMAN NAGEL

(This paper was read at the annual conference sponsored by the Lutheran Council of Great Britain, May 28—31. "The Doctrine of Scripture" was the subject of the conference, at which the Lutheran groups concerned about doctrinal unity among Lutherans were represented.)

THE way Scripture understands itself is presented elsewhere in the theses sent out by the Council. That presentation has its greatest strength in bringing Scripture into close and integral relationship with Christ. Faith's primary apprehension is Christ; the consequent apprehension is Scripture. To apprehend Christ is to be placed under Scripture. The recognition of this is the basis of how we listen to what Scripture says. Scripture has spoken Christ to us, and therefore, when Scripture speaks, we receive and accept whatever it says, for whatever it says is heard in relationship to Christ.

What we have called the first and second apprehensions (of Christ and of the Scripture) are not to be seen as antithetical or exclusive but much rather as mutually inclusive. The authority of Scripture is not an independent authority. It has a derived authority, but not a different authority from that of Him whom it speaks to us.

It is the first apprehension which saves and not the second. A man is saved by Christ and not by the Scriptures, though to talk in this way may be to fall into the error of speaking as if there were some disharmony between them. Yet we may perhaps permit ourselves that statement in order to underline the Christ-aloneness of our salvation. Where there is the inconsistency of a man's confessing Christ but depreciating Scripture, we must say that his faith will save him. However, if we love that man, we will do what we can to free him of that disease, which, if it spreads, will rob him of Christ. If we love Christ, we shall not consent to giving Him less than the honor which is due Him as He is revealed in the Scriptures.

The primary task is to preach Christ and Him crucified. In doing this we are of course preaching nothing else but Scripture. We do not, however, first strive to bring men to acknowledge Scripture and then from this go on to point to Christ. Our preaching points

to Christ, and when He is acknowledged, then have Christ and Scripture achieved their single purpose. This acknowledgment contains the recognition that God has dealt with a man and that He has dealt with him through Scripture. Scripture is seen as the tool of God's action. What it says is the fact of the matter. Its authority is God's authority.

The consideration of Scripture's authority takes us from the realm of apologetics into the church and the realm of systematics. While the church is occupied only in proclamation, this is not a step that it is necessary explicitly to take. So long as Christ is being proclaimed, Scripture is performing its function. When men are attentive to Christ, they are attentive to Scripture. Among those, however, who are attentive to Scripture there is naturally discussion of Scripture; and when "another gospel" is taught, then Christians are forced to reject this as contrary to Christ, and they can show it to be so only from Scripture, for there is no other Christ for us than the Christ of Scripture. Of this there is abundant evidence in the history of the church. When the proclamation has been challenged, the church has had to examine what she is saying and to clarify and fortify her stand. This is the task of systematic theology and always means recourse to Scripture. The task is to clarify "the faith once given to the saints" — not to amputate or invent. The church did not begin proclaiming the true deity of Christ after the Council of Nicaea, nor the doctrine of the Trinity after 381. The precise statements were called forth by the challenge of denial. So long as there was no denial, there was no necessity for precise clarification in defense against it.

This paper, in the first part, would offer evidence that within the church the authority of Scripture was universally acknowledged. The recent episode of negative criticism growing out of the Enlightenment presented the challenge that called for precise clarification in defense against its attacks on what had always been acknowledged in the church. We are still historically not sufficiently removed from this episode to view it as we do, e. g., Montanism. Its effects are still too much with us, and its challenge, though growing less acute as liberalism decays, must be faced by us. We must face it honestly and with the confidence that in the providence of God here is a challenge and a situation which He would use

to build us up so that our loyalty to Him is clearer and stronger and our usefulness to Him more humble and vigorous.

While our Confessions do not face this challenge — the authority of Scripture is there everywhere implicitly acknowledged — the second part of this paper will attempt to show what sort of answer would be in harmony with them by an exercise of the *analogia fidei* kind.

I

Since there is always the danger that those engaged in a particular discussion or struggle will tend to exaggerate its magnitude, it may be useful to see our problem in the perspective of the centuries of the church. For as long as we know of the church, the authority of Scripture has been implicitly or explicitly acknowledged. The apostles themselves claimed to teach on the authority of the Scripture, which for them was the Old Testament. In the subapostolic age we find the same, and here the recorded words of the apostles were as Scripture authoritative.

Polycarp declares that "neither he nor any like him is able to attain to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul." "He is the first-born of Satan whoever perverts the *logia* of the Lord." *Logia* is used of quotations from the old and new Scriptures.

Frequent in Barnabas are such phrases as "the Lord saith in the prophet," and "the Spirit of the Lord prophesieth." He says, "The prophets received their gift from Christ and spoke of Him."

In Clement of Rome there continually appear "for Scripture saith," "by the testimony of Scripture," and "the Holy Spirit saith." He exhorts "to look carefully into the Scriptures, which are the true utterances of the Holy Spirit." "The blessed Paul wrote by inspiration [πνευματικῶς] to the Corinthians."

Among the Apologists Justin Martyr declares:

Christians believe on the voice of God which has been expressed to them by the Apostles of Christ and proclaimed by the Prophets.

Their work is to announce that which the Holy Spirit, descending upon them, purposes through them to teach those who wish to learn the true religion.

For neither by nature nor human thought can men recognize such great and divine truths, but by the gift which came down from above upon the holy men, who needed no art of words nor

skill in captious and contentious speaking, but only to offer themselves in purity to the operation of the Divine Spirit, in order that the divine power of itself might reveal to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things acting on just men as a plectrum on a harp or lyre.

There are allegorizings, but the literal sense is not called in question. Athanagoras is almost free of allegorizing, but for him Inspiration is mantic and mechanical.

When we come to Irenaeus, we find the tendency to find secondary meanings more fully developed. Yet Christ "was the hidden Treasure in the field of Scripture." The apostles are beyond all falsehood. Their writings reflect their individuality. "No small punishment will be his who adds to, or takes from, the Scriptures." "Nothing is empty or without meaning in the dealings of God." We may be perplexed by it, yet "all Scripture, as it has been given to us by God, will be found to be harmonious."

From Hippolytus:

As the divine Scriptures proclaimed the truth, so let us view it; all they teach let us acknowledge by the growth of faith; as the Father pleases to be believed, let us believe Him; as the Son pleases to be glorified, let us glorify Him; as the Holy Spirit pleases to be given, let us receive Him; not according to our own choice, or our own mind, forcing to our own tastes that which has been given by God, but as He chose to show the truth through the Holy Scriptures, so let us view it.

For Cyprian the books of the Old and New Testaments are "the foundation of our hope, the bulwark of our faith, the support of our hearts, the guide of our path, the safeguard of our salvation." In preparing men for martyrdom he rejects "the intricacies of human speech" and "sets down those things which God says and by which Christ exhorts His servants."

From Alexandria Clement declares that the foundations of our faith are sure, "for we have received them from God through the Scriptures." In him there is a great concern for the inner meaning, which we may not belittle when it is "the interpretation of the Scriptures which has been made clear by Christ"; but when it leads him to fanciful constructions, we can only recognize in it a tendency which has been a plague to the church and, as a desire to evade the

plain meaning in favor of a word behind the word, is banefully still with us.

Origen is a prime example of this, though even he is not eager to surrender the literal meaning. He does not hesitate to say that Christians receive the words of Paul as the words of God. "We cannot say of the writings of the Holy Spirit that anything in them is otiose or superfluous, even if they seem to some obscure." "When you have been unable to find the reason for that which is written, do not blame the holy letters; lay the blame on yourself alone."

"The remarkable unanimity of the early Fathers in their views on Holy Scripture" is Westcott's verdict.¹

Other authorities came to be recognized. Tradition and bishops received acknowledgment, and philosophy was used in the demonstration of the validity of what Scripture said. However, despite the roles played by these, Scripture was acknowledged as prime authority and assertions of doctrine required the support of Scripture.

In Augustine we find the statement that he would not believe the Scriptures if they had not been given him by the church, and after the Dark Ages philosophy assumed a dominant role which finds its climax in Aquinas.

Nevertheless whoever contradicts Scripture is a heretic, and the heretics themselves claimed Scripture. This universal acknowledgment of Scripture we may call catholic. It is also Protestant as that word was defined at the Diet of Spire in 1529.

There is, we affirm, no sure preaching or doctrine but that which abides by the Word of God. According to God's command no other doctrine should be preached. Each text of the divine Scriptures should be elucidated and explained by other texts. This Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian; it shines clearly in its own light, and is found to enlighten the darkness. We are determined by God's grace and aid to abide by God's Word alone, the Holy Gospel contained in the Biblical books of the Old and New Testaments. This Word alone shall be preached, and nothing that is contrary to it. It is the only truth. It is the sure rule of all Christian doctrine and conduct. It can never fail or deceive us.

¹ Almost all the quotations from the Fathers are to be found in Appendix B of Westcott's *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (London & Cambridge: Macmillan, 1867).

Whoso builds and abides on this foundation shall stand against all the gates of hell, while all human additions and vanities set up against it must fall before the presence of God.

Popes and councils may err but not Scripture. Scripture is the source and norm of doctrine. When Scripture was restored to its position of supreme authority, the props of other authorities were set aside. The whole weight rested on Scripture. One word of Scripture was more valid than all the thoughts and formulations of men. No other doctrine should be preached than that of Scripture.

Yet when the Pope and all the heretics claim to be preaching Scripturally, whose teaching has the authority of Scripture? The Lutheran answer does not evade this question, nor does it resort to secondary authorities. It holds high Scripture in such a way that Scripture has no other than its own authority and wins conviction by no other power than that which inheres in it. "It shines in its own light." *Scriptura Scripturae interpres*. The light of Scripture is Christ. He is the focal point. All the parts have their meaning and validity in relationship with Him. He is the Key. First a man must know Christ, and then he will understand Scripture. Hence the right distinction of Law and Gospel. Where this is ignored, Christ is not honored as Scripture presents Him, but He is made another Lawgiver, and then the full Gospel is denied and Scripture darkened.

The Lutheran Reformation opened Scripture not so much by translations, Erasmus could have done that, but by clearly showing Christ to be what the Scriptures say of Him, i. e., He through whom we are justified by grace through faith. Other reformations which called for a reformation according to the Scriptures but where Christ was not fully recognized as He through whom alone the sinner is justified, where Law and Gospel were not rightly divided, missed the mark, and the Gospel was made the equal or the servant of the Law. This meant synergism in the doctrine of salvation, and also the validity of Scripture was somehow made to depend on man's effort and response. Scripture was the Word of God because of man's acceptance or because of its effects on man. When salvation is not entirely *extra nos*, so also Scripture's authority is not *extra nos*. This can be discerned in Calvin's use of the testi-

monium Spiritus Sancti internum. This is also a taint of which Melancthon was not innocent, and Melancthon has not been without progeny in the Lutheran Church.

Here the authority of Scripture is sabotaged, for its authority is made dependent on something in man. That something in man was among the enthusiasts experience, in the Enlightenment the correspondence with reason, among the Pietists feeling, and among the liberals the moral effects. When these are part of the grounds of faith, it is little wonder that the attacks on Scripture were so successful.

The Enlightenment continued the Renaissance's rebellion against authority. The authority of the church was overthrown. Next the authority of Scripture was undermined by making it dependent on man's reason, and in the glorification of the individual private judgment was enthroned. For a while there was the double-mindedness of formal acknowledgment of Scripture and of the supremacy of reason. As reason encroached, Scripture was forced to retreat. When Scripture was attacked, there was no compelling call to defend it, for the real foundation had been moved from Scripture to reason.

To the Enlightenment God was transcendent, but was not allowed to interfere with the regulations of reason. The next step was to make God immanent. What had been thought of as coming from outside, or at least that to which revelation had been reduced, was now discerned within. Instead of projecting the findings of reason upon a transcendent screen and thus portraying God, men turned within and, in accordance with the findings there, God was refashioned. However, a god that cannot stand on His own feet is a god that comes tumbling down when the props are knocked away. In the interests of apologetics some, seeking contact with their contemporaries, tied their message in with the thought of the day. This proved to be a short-term investment that ends in bankruptcy when there is a swing in the market. When reason slumps, the god tied up with reason finds no buyers; when feeling is at a discount, the god tied up with feeling is a dead loss.

Kant demolished reason's capacity to know God. Spinoza put God inside. Goethe dispensed the poison, and Schleiermacher gave

it a Christian label. Hegel put God through his paces in history, and this harsh century has seen the debunking of romanticism.

Now in England, where pious mothers tell their little children that bad German philosophies, when they die, go to Oxford, the movement away from Scripture was slower. Coleridge and Carlyle were the heralds of immanentism, and Wordsworth gave it poetic expression.

A man's conception of revelation depends on his conception of God. Those who thought of God as immanent could not accept a revelation coming from God outside the world. "An authoritative revelation implies the incompetence of human reason either to discover or to criticize its contents."² Such a confession of incompetence the immanentists could not make, and synergism plays a sinister role in this land, which gave the world Pelagius. Revelation as the act of God dishonors man; therefore the emphasis shifted from God's disclosure to man's discovery. With the help of Hegel and Darwin the Scripture became an account of man's progressive discovery of God. The Scripture might help a man in his discovery, but it is nothing like indispensable. When the Scripture was attacked, there was no full-scale resistance, for it was not the citadel. The Oxford Movement retreated to a position whose defenses were the church, tradition, and the apostolic succession. Newman found better defenses of this kind in Rome.

I have deliberately not discussed the items raised by higher criticism and science, for I would suggest that since they are capable of being received without necessitating the undermining of Scripture, the way in which they were, in fact, generally received was determined not by the compulsion in themselves but by philosophical and other considerations.

II

A consideration that has already transpired in this paper is the assertion of man's capacity in spiritual things, the damnable *aliquid in homine*. This *aliquid in homine* was faced by our Confessions in soteriology but not explicitly in the matter of Scripture. We face it and, I suggest, the Lutheran answer is the same in both cases.

In the doctrine of justification we proclaim the grace of God.

² John Caird, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* (Glasgow: James Maclehose, 1904), p. 6.

His is the initiative and the achievement. Our salvation is sure because it is *extra nos*. Similarly the statement of God's dealing with men, His will and grace, is His in initiative and achievement. Its validity does not depend on something in man. Its certainty is *extra nos*. As works undermine justification, the insertion into our use of Scripture of human achievement undermines the authority of Scripture. As Christ must be taken entire as He is and not just a part that should make up the deficiency of our efforts, so the Scripture is to be taken entire and not just the parts we select as necessary to be then rounded out with the addition of what we feel to be required. In that also there is bondage to the weak and beggarly elements of which St. Paul speaks.

In the doctrine of conversion we confess "that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ." It is not by our decision that we are converted. It is by the action of the Holy Ghost through the Gospel. Similarly no part of Scripture is true because I decide that it is true. I am brought to the acknowledgment of the Scriptures by the Holy Ghost, who is active in them.

In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper we confess the Sacrament to be what the enscriptured words of Christ declare and make it. The *manducatio indignorum* makes quite clear that the Sacrament does not depend on anything in man. Should the pastor and all the communicants believe otherwise than the words of Christ declare, it would still be the Sacrament, for Christ's words make it what it is. Similarly, should all men deny part or all of the Scripture, it does not by that become false.

In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper Lutherans have been careful to venerate and not probe the mystery. When Zwingli probed at Marburg, Luther rebuked him for his mathematics. We are bound by a single word of Scripture whether we can understand it or not. Ours is not to explain but to worship. We are told the fact. How such a thing can be we cannot grasp. We may not suggest how we think it can be and then alter the fact to fit our suggestion. Transubstantiation and symbolic or spiritual presence we reject with horror, not so much because they are wrong as rather because of their insolence in probing the mystery and prescribing to God. Impanation we reject as such another unpermissible attempt. When the Lutheran doctrine has been characterized as con-

substantiation, we have rejected the term. We cannot divide the host and say, "This is body" and "This is bread." The Lutheran usage "in, with, and under" contains the confession that both we and our words are inadequate to grasp the mystery. We know the $\delta\tau\iota$ but not the $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$.

It is similar with Scripture. In, with, and under Scripture God reveals Himself to us. The mystery of revelation we cannot probe. We may not suggest how and then alter the fact to fit the suggestion. In this some of our orthodox dogmaticians would seem to have been less circumspect than they might. Not content with stating the fact, they attempted some explanation and so weakened the position they were set to uphold. The *extra usum* seems also to be going too far—as if the unsaid words of institution could constitute a Sacrament—though the term can be justified in the light of that against which it was directed. We are not called upon to explain the *how* of Scripture. Any attempt to do so is by analogy out of harmony with our Confessions.

On the one hand the Lutheran confessors had to defend the integrity of the bread and, on the other, the integrity of the body. In defense of Scripture we are similarly called on to fight on two fronts. If the Scripture is transubstantiated, then God's gracious coming all the way to us through an earthly thing, the verbal medium, is denied. A scorning of the genuine earthly medium with the considerations of setting and personality impoverishes our understanding of what is said and diminishes the grace of God. God was born of Mary a genuine man. When Jesus of Nazareth spoke, a man was speaking, and God was speaking, and this not only when *ex cathedra* or "of the relationship of God to man" but also when at table He asked them to pass the fish or when He said, "Tomorrow we go to Jerusalem." To take geography and history out of the words of Jesus is to make a docetic Christ who is not our Brother or our Savior. Similarly we may not docetize the bread or the Scriptures. God deals with us through bread and human words. Human words are things of time and place. Hence to reject the geography and history of Scripture is to reject the genuineness of the earthly means and to diminish the incredible condescension and grace of God.

When we are told not to bother whether the first chapters of

Genesis or the Virgin Birth ever happened or not but to take hold only of what they mean for the relationship of God to man, we are being invited to spiritualize the earthly means. When God speaks to us, He uses our language. We may not be more "spiritual" or clever than that. We may not say to God: "You really need not have treated us as being quite so simple. We can operate on a level higher than that. The spiritual truths would suffice without all that tiresome Israelitish history. We can grasp the truth of the Virgin Birth without its having to happen; and so long as we know of triumph over death, we can even dispense with the resurrection."

God, however, does not seem to have agreed with this line of thought. He did not give us just basic axioms, and we may not behave as if He did by dispensing with the illustrative embellishments and apprehending merely the theorems of divine geometry.

We do not apprehend. We are apprehended. We are apprehended as His creatures, and He takes hold of us with the media of our creatureliness, humanity, water, bread, wine, and words. Our rescue does not undo the Creation. Men, body and soul and our kin of creation, are redeemed. Our consummation is in being what God designed us to be. A denial of this lurks in every attempt "to be like God," to know as God knows, to be on the spiritual level of His language and not our own, in every rebellion against our creatureliness, in every assertion that God does not have to come quite so far to us, and in every embarrassment at the irrepressible living God, who acts in the utmost corners of our lives and world. His deeds are contrary to human prescription. Nothing is too low to be appropriated to His use and mercy, whether it be the womb of the lowly Virgin or the mouth of a donkey. We may not apologize for God and try to help Him to a more intellectually respectable procedure by lifting Him out of His humbling Himself to us so utterly. If He does not have to come so far to save us, then of course some of the distance is our achievement, and then is our salvation shaken. In God's humbling Himself to us is our salvation, and therefore we shall not wish to diminish it or spiritualize it away. And there is a yet greater reason, for therein is God's honor.³ It is of His honor that He graciously humbles Himself, that He speaks our language with all that that entails. The untidiness of Scrip-

³ Cf. Dr. Luther, WA XXIII, 156 and XIX, 486.

ture and its recalcitrance to our notions and logic are the measure of God's outreach to us. It is of a piece with us and our world. Through this creatureliness and muddle God comes to us. What a God!

Such an acceptance of Scripture can scarcely be charged with rationalism and with the charge of "making it easy." This charge must surely rebound on the heads of those who make it, for it is the excisions which are prompted by a desire to remove some difficulty that does not fit with rationalistic notions that are imposed upon Scripture.

No more than we can divide the Person of Christ or the sacramental host can we divide the Scriptures and say, "This is of God" and "This is of man." The very assertion "This is of God" carries in it the confession of our inability to say such a thing of ourselves. If we could explain what divine revelation is, and how it is possible, what we explained would be precisely not divine revelation. We may not pretend to usurp the function of the Holy Ghost. To speak of the Word of God when all that is meant is the words of men raised to the nth degree, is an abuse of language. If the Word of God is the Word of *God*, how can it be authenticated by any but God Himself? We can and must testify that Scripture is the Word of God, but nothing we can do or say can authenticate it. To seek to prove here is only to disprove.

The Lutheran understanding of the church and the means of grace also throws light. The church is there where the means of grace are. We hold to nothing less and nothing more. These are *extra nos* and therefore sure. We may not tamper or add. We cannot permit the certainty to be undermined by the insistence on something of man whether it be polity of Popes, bishops, or presbyters, a discipline or a degree of sanctification.

The means of grace are not within our judgment and control. If we exhort any man to be or become a Lutheran, it can only be with our conviction of the supremacy and inviolability of the means of grace. If Holy Baptism or selected passages of Scripture are set aside, we damage the church. Tampering with the means of grace is treason to the church. Only when the means of grace are solid *extra nos*, requiring no human validation, is our faith in the church unassailable. Unless we have certainty here, we have no right to

separate existence in this country but should then close our churches and join the established churches.

Fundamentalism is thought by some to provide the necessary certainty. From Fundamentalism Lutherans are safeguarded by the distinction of Law and Gospel and the *opus alienum*. The Law is indeed the Word of God but not a word that may infiltrate and blur the Gospel. They are both true, but the Gospel supersedes the Law, which is the schoolmaster to lead to Christ. However, just as the Law may not be allowed to infiltrate the Gospel, so the Gospel may not be allowed to infiltrate the Law. If the Gospel is isolated out of Scripture and the Law is neglected, there is complacency and laziness. A man stays at home with his ever-gracious Jesus and digs the garden on Sunday. The church is neglected, and the statistics of attendance at the Holy Communion fall appallingly low. The danger on the side opposite to Fundamentalism is this isolation of the Gospel. Instead of the whole Scripture a kerygma is extracted and the forgiveness of sins is diligently assured to men for whom the word "sin" has lost its meaning and crushing terror. Or a Gospel is proclaimed which is some piece of man's wisdom dressed in Scriptural terms that can be pressed into service while the rest of Scripture is ignored or suppressed.

We may not select for ourselves a kerygma and dispense with the rest. People who go through Scripture selectively, declaring "This is kerygma" and "This is not kerygma," are no longer "unter der Schrift," as Dr. Luther admonished, but are making magisterial use of their judgment, and their findings are no more reliable than their own judgment. *Extra nos* is eliminated. This cannot be defended with the principle that Christ is the Sum and Center of Scripture. That He certainly is, and He is the Christ who acknowledged Scripture, used it as authoritative, fulfilled it, spoke of jot and tittle, and declared "Scripture cannot be broken." Nor is there defense in Luther's dictum *soweit sie Christum treibet*, for, as the late Dr. Kramm pointed out, this is a principle of interpretation and not of selection.⁴

In conclusion, then, if we would speak of Scripture in harmony with the Confessions, we must avoid all synergism, all human

⁴ H. H. Kramm, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (London: James Clarke, 1947), p. 113.

authentication, we must maintain the *extra nos*, state the $\delta\tau\iota$ and not probe the $\pi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$, defend the integrity of the earthly element, rightly distinguish Law and Gospel and not set up magisterial reason in selecting and discarding. We must let God do things the way He has chosen to do them. The Scripture is His doing. When the Scripture speaks, that is it.

Books on the history of doctrine sometimes give the impression that when Schleiermacher arose, everybody began preaching the Gospel according to Schleiermacher, whereas there were yet more than seven thousand pastors who continued quietly building the kingdom of God as they proclaimed what Scripture spoke. We live in a time when theological fashions seem to be changing. The Scripture that was left in bits and pieces by higher criticism is coming together again.

It is true that a man can live without an appendix, and can even lose a kidney or a lung and not die, but vigorous health and the strength to endure hardship are in the robust wholeness of the body, which is of God fearfully and wonderfully made. We may, with St. Augustine, be at a loss to explain why God gave men paps, but that does not permit us to deny that God did it or that He did it wisely.

The question: "What can be dispensed with?" is being replaced by the question: "What can be maintained?" There is talk of the rediscovery of the Bible, which is surely useful. The Old Testament is being rehabilitated. One hears not so much of the theology of Paul and Peter and Jesus. There are nowadays theologies of the New Testament and of the Old Testament. Tomorrow may see a theology of the Scripture.

While being grateful for all that is helpful for our growth in understanding and using Scripture, we have really such a job on our hands as does not allow us to follow and wear what happens to be the fashion of the moment. The pastor, as Christ's under-shepherd to whose care redeemed men are committed, will, in faithfulness to his Master, his call, and his office, stand in the pulpit with the abiding Scripture in his hand and say, "Thus saith the Lord."

London, England

Studies on Free Texts from the Old Testament

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

1 KINGS 19:4-12

The Text and Its Central Thought.—After the spectacular Carmel victory of Elijah over the prophets of Baal, the Prophet entertained high hopes that Israel would return to the worship of Jehovah and that Jezebel's efforts to make Baalism the state religion would be thwarted. But instead of capitulating, the queen hurled defiance at the Prophet and threatened him with death. This also cooled considerably the enthusiasm of the people and of the vacillating king. His hopes dashed, Elijah turned and ran from the fray and left the Kingdom of Israel for the safety of the desert south of Beersheba. Here beneath a juniper (broom) he prayed for death, convinced that the cause of true religion was hopeless in the face of a determined paganism.

After rest and refreshment twice miraculously provided through angelic hands, God made known to him that he must go 200 miles in a period of 40 days and nights to Horeb, the scene of the Covenant God's appearance to Moses. It is most significant that Horeb was named and that a period of 40 days and nights was set.

Through the symbolism of tempest, earthquake, and fire, God wanted to show to Elijah and to all men that He does not operate in the Kingdom of Grace by His omnipotence. "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit." There will be judgments prior to the great Judgment in which God's power will be utilized to break the hardness of the heart of man, but under normal circumstances He will operate not by the spectacular, not by the phenomenal, not by the compulsion of His power, but by the "still small voice."

Noteworthy is the use of the term "voice." God calls men to repentance and faith through His Word. Displays of omnipotence may prepare men's hearts for the Word, but only the Word can convert, because through it the Spirit is imparted. This Word is, of course, God's pure Word without human admixture, and His entire Word.

"Still" and "small," or "gentle rustling," as the original denotes it, implies the merciful purpose of God in this Word. This is not the thunder of Sinai, though that, too, has its purpose, but the sweet pleading "Come unto Me" of the Gospel. So God has ordained that men's hearts are to be changed and prepared for His indwelling. So are men to be won for heaven.

"What doest thou here?" (vv. 9, 13) as well as God's command to anoint Hazeal, Jehu, and Elisha implies that Elijah and other human intermediaries are to speak this "voice." Elijah was a prophet. He had no business being away from men and in the desert, because he was obligated to speak the "still small voice." Modern prophets—and every Christian is one—must likewise by word and deed echo the "still small voice."

The burden of the text, then, is this: God desires to draw men to Him, not by spectacular displays of power, not by pomp and circumstance, not by catastrophic judgment, but by the tender pleading of the Gospel, which we are privileged to proclaim.

The Day and Its Theme.—The Propers of the day round out this thought nicely. The Introit pleads that men hear God's Word and find refuge in His deliverance. The Gradual urges the singing of God's praise for His wondrous salvation. The Collect bespeaks readiness to do God's bidding and invokes His protection on such as do His will. The Epistle emphasizes the need for true conversion before God's will can be done. The Gospel points out that the heart of the Christian religion is not the performance of miracle works, nor betterment of social conditions, but "the forgiveness of sins."

Sins to Be Diagnosed and Remedied.—This text strikes at the very heart of one of the great problems in the Christian Church today. Rome lusts for power and seeks to win adherents through spectacular displays of pomp and circumstance. Reformed churches tend to the principle that conversion is a matter of externals: a better environment and a set of new and good habits for the old and bad. Sometimes Lutherans have forgotten that God's plan is the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins through Christ and the pleading on His part, through the church, for the souls of men. The Gospel, and not buildings, accessions, growth, large sums gathered, etc., must be our boast.

Goal and Purpose of the Sermon.—The proclamation of the simple Gospel, not lavish displays or pretentious buildings, is the one great purpose of the church and its members. The church programs and the lives of God's people must revolve about this point.

Opportunities for Explicit Gospel.—Not only the "gentle rustling voice" but also the kindly and gracious treatment of the errant Prophet indicates the message of God's love by which He would persuade men. Such is God's kindness to men.

Illustrations and New Testament Parallels.—Christ's rebuke of the "sons of thunder," James and John, who desired to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable Samaritan village (Luke 9:51-56).

God's rebuke of Jonah's anger at Nineveh's repentance. The parables, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Son show God reaching for men. The Great Commission says that this is to be done through the proclamation of the simple Gospel. Paul's preaching (1 Cor. 1: 18-24; 2:1-5) also illustrates this point.

Outline

Introduction: When is a church successful in God's thinking? Not externals, such as large churches, memberships, budgets, not involved programs or activities, but when the simple Gospel is preached.

I. The voice is God's voice in Scripture

- A. Not the voice of nature or catastrophes.
- B. But revealed truth, as to Moses at Horeb and to other holy men at "sundry times and in divers manners," but especially through His Son.
- C. This is a word of gentle pleading.
 - 1. Not dictatorial or condemning (John 8:1-11).
 - 2. But merciful and kind.

How God through Christ made it possible for men to be saved.
 - 3. Reflected in God's treatment of the fleeing Prophet.
- D. This is a Word of God's pleading.
 - 1. Nothing human dare be added. Not philosophies of men. Not reason.
 - 2. All of the counsel of God is designed to preach the Gospel. All Scripture must be understood in relation to its central point.

II. This voice must be proclaimed to men

- A. The church — Elijah, a prophet. His duty. God criticized him for failure to do so. "What doest thou here?"

So the church today through pastors, missionaries, and the printed page must set forth the Gospel.
- B. But each Christian, too, has this responsibility. Both direct Scripture and the example of the early church bear this out.
- C. Involves planning and programs. Hazael, John, Elisha anointed to further the Kingdom and its work. V. 15. Evangelism efforts, joint services, public relations, all play their role, but always the Gospel of God's love for men must be featured.

Conclusion: This was the program of the church of the Reformation that succeeded so admirably. It must be the program of the church of the Reformation today.

San Francisco, Calif.

ARTHUR C. NITZ

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

PSALM 42

The Text and Its Central Thought.—Psalm 42 opens the second book of the Psalter. Here the over-all emphasis is on sin and redemption. This initial song sets forth redemption as particularly apprehended within the framework of *worship*.

Three ideas are interlaced within these stanzas: 1. The disquiet of the soul cut off from worship. 2. The unquestioned power and will-iness of God to save. 3. The trust that God's help will again be realized within the worship service in the temple. Note the frequent and varied reference to "my soul" in the second and third person as the writer describes his anguish. This son of Korah had been a leader in the temple procession and its music. Now in exile, cut off from public worship, he finds his life unstrung. The "glad shouts and songs of thanksgiving" are replaced by the daily taunts of his enemies and the janglings of his own disintegrated spirit. Tears are his sustenance, as body reflects the hunger and thirst of soul. The very elements of creation threaten and thunder against him. Yet God is the Lord of life. His steadfast love does not change, day or night. His song is still within the heart, though unheard without and interrupted within. Salvation will come. God will restore his child to the homeland and to the temple. Vv. 5 and 11 are both creed and petition: "Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise Him who is the Health of my countenance and my God." The central thought may be stated: The distraught man of God longs for the consolation of worship in God's house.

The Day and Its Theme.—The theme for the Twentieth Sunday is: "In our worship we praise God's mercy." The Introit directs the attention to ". . . the city of our God, the mountain of His holiness." The Collect pleads for pardon and peace that may lead to a "quiet mind" in exchange for the "disquieted" (this quietness consists not in inactivity, but in finding the traits of personality integrated under the redemption of the Cross and channeled into powerful accomplishment within Christ's kingdom). The Epistle urges that the time be redeemed in the face of evil days first of all in acts of worship—the speaking

of psalms, hymns, spiritual songs—then also in works of obedience. The Gospel underlines the tragedy of those rejecting God's invitation of grace. *Parish Activities* places emphasis on building a praying church.

The Goal and Purpose of the Sermon.—To strengthen in the hearer a longing and love for worship in God's house among God's people. The particular challenge is not to reprimand for lax worship attendance but to show that life is no life at all save as it is held through the means of grace within the creative, redeeming, and sanctifying hand of God.

Sin to Be Diagnosed and Remedied.—The sermon may show the devastating effects on the human soul of those enemies, the devils, who make us absent ourselves from the presence of God and the company of His people—the "they" voices (v. 3), which taunt the modern mind with material pressures and anxieties, driving it to spiritual exile, disintegration, and death.

Opportunities for Explicit Gospel.—Worship leads us into the presence of the God of our salvation. In worship the Holy Spirit takes the crazed and broken soul of a man and, reorienting him through the Cross of Christ, which comprehends all of death and life, reintegrates his being—spirit, mind, and body—enabling him to live purposefully with physical creation and within the society of which God has made him a part and promising him also pleasures in God's service forevermore.

Illustrations and New Testament Parallels.—This poem itself is replete with imagery suggesting channels of illustration and expression. Note particularly the sound words, the contrasting of harmony and cacophony as related to the human soul. Isaiah 55; John 4:14 and 7:37 suggest themselves with v. 2.

Alexander Schmemmann has described Christian worship as a *procession* (v. 4) of God's people into the presence of the living Christ, where the Savior receives them, speaks with them, instructs them, comforts them, shares His body and redeeming blood with them, binds them together in the mystical body of His church; then sends them forth to do the Father's bidding in the world.

Outline

The Christian Longs for the Blessings of Worship

- I. The soul without worship disintegrates and dies
 - A. The Psalmist describes his disquieted soul.
 - B. Modern man dies spiritually when apart from God.

II. God invites all men to the blessings of worship

- A. He offers the means of grace, churches, the right of free assembly, the Lord's Day (Gospel).
- B. He urges man to redeem the time in spiritual growth (Epistle).

III. The worshiping soul lives in fruitful communion with God and the church

- A. The Holy Spirit sustains him in the mystical union with Christ.
- B. He unites him by faith with Christians in the congregation, the mission field, the church suffering persecution (the interceding church).
- C. He strengthens him to live effectively within God's physical creation and society.

Farmington, Mich.

A. KARL BOEHMKE

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

ISAIAH 59:17-21

The Text and Its Central Thought.—These are clearly bound up with the great redeeming work of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we shall get a much better feel of the power and impact of this splendid text when we think of the Champion not in the terms of the Person of Jesus but rather in terms of our wondrous and glorious God.

In simple and bold outline, this 59th chapter shows us, in panoramic view, the battlefield of this world, where the satanic forces of evil threaten to rob God of the people He created for Himself. And seeing "that there was no man . . . that there was no intercessor" (v. 16) to champion the cause of His people, God Himself takes the field to protect and save His people. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself" (2 Cor. 5:19).

Thus Isaiah has but one purpose in this whole chapter, namely, to fix people's eyes of faith and hope on their God, their one and only Protector and Savior. Having already hinted at His saving power in verse one, the Prophet first pictures the fearful plight of man: enslaved by Satan, ruined by sin, blinded by warped thinking, sapped by indulgence (vv. 2-15), and then focuses all attention upon God, who, Himself taking the field, armed to the teeth (v. 17), lifts the standard of heaven against the hosts of hell. And to give everyone confidence in

this great God and Protector, he shows that there is no halfheartedness in God's determination to protect and save His people. Clothed in "a garment of vengeance" and "clad with zeal as a cloke" (v. 17), he pictures Him striking out with "fury" and "recompence" against the foes of His people (v. 18). Nor does it matter if "the enemy come in like a flood" (v. 19), strong enough to completely overwhelm His people, God's strategy of love and grace will hold the field. The forces of evil will meet their defeat in His Redeemer (v. 20) and in His Spirit, who will not depart from His people and their seed and their seed's seed forever (v. 21).

The Day and Its Theme.—How well our text fits into the theme for this day! Both Epistle and Gospel throw into bold relief the forces of evil and the determined love and grace of God to protect and save His people. Not only does the Epistle (Eph. 6:10-17) alert us to the "principalities, powers, rulers of darkness and spiritual wickedness" pitted against us, calling for the whole armor of God, but also the Gospel (John 4:46-54) shows us the deadliness of it all by leading us to one "at the point of death." None can help or save except God, who is there to say: "Go thy way, thy son liveth." And while the Introit acknowledges: "O Lord, King Almighty, there is no man that can gainsay Thee," the Gradual concludes: "They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed but abideth forever."

The Goal and Purpose of the Sermon.—It is clearly charted by the text. It must impress the listeners with the undeniable fact that, left to themselves on the battlefield of life, there would be no escape from the doom of sin and evil; but then it must leave hearts beating with joy and gratitude over so wondrous a God, a true Protector and Savior.

Sin Diagnosed and Remedied.—The text does not call for the diagnosis of any particular sin, but it does call for a clear presentation of the reality and deadliness of sin, against which there is no protection and for which there is no remedy except the "zeal of the Lord," so pointedly set forth in the text.

Opportunities for Explicit Gospel.—The text will not let you bypass it.

Illustrations and New Testament Parallels.—A story like the Exodus, where God Himself with mighty arm brings the Israelites out of their awful captivity and safely brings them into the Promised Land, may indeed illustrate man's complete dependence upon God for any deliverance from the powers of evil, but God's zeal for the salvation of sinners has no parallel.

Outline

God Is the Protector of His People

I. There is none other to help His people

- A. They are overwhelmed by an enemy "come in like a flood" (v. 19).

"We wrestle not against flesh and blood" (Epistle).

"Dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1).

- B. They have "no man . . . no intercessor" to champion their cause (v. 16).

"None of them can by any means redeem his brother" (Ps. 49:7).

II. God alone is fully armed to take the field against the enemy (v. 17)

- A. He has a perfect Redeemer (v. 20).

One "who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (Heb. 7:26).

- B. He has a mighty Spirit, who will not depart from His people (v. 21).

"The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John 6:63).

Corvallis, Oreg.

A. W. SCHELP

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

PSALM 123

The Text and Its Central Thought.—This is one of the fifteen psalms (120—134) which are entitled simply "songs of degrees." A few of these ancient liturgical pieces have been ascribed to David, one to Solomon, and the authors of the rest are unknown. It is not our desire to go into the problem of the meaning of the title, but it is possible that the psalm before us was written during the Exile or after the Exile, since v. 4 speaks of a situation which fits conditions in Babylon and after the Jews' return to Palestine. They were exposed to derision and contempt for their loyalty to their faith. The Psalm is a prayer from the depths of distress, more specifically it is a prayer for mercy, for forgiveness. The Psalmist directs the prayer to the proper source, Jehovah, the God of mercy, of forgiveness in Christ. Lifting up the eyes is the Oriental form of prayer showing that God dwells in the high places above, as the Psalmist himself says, "O Thou

that dwellest in the heavens." Although God is everywhere, the Scriptures everywhere depict Him as dwelling above. Cp. Ps. 2:4. This is an exact counterpart of Jesus' exemplary prayer, "Our Father who art in heaven," and the preacher will naturally make use of all the suggested thoughts. The only real difficulty in the Psalm is what is meant by the looking at the hand of masters and mistresses on the part of slaves (v. 2). We know it is a picture from ancient Oriental master-slave culture, but to what does it refer? Some understand it as the hand of punishment which strikes the slave. When beaten, slaves look with pleading eyes to their master knowing that this is the only way to stop the lash. However, since neither masters nor mistresses actually did the punishing, especially not the mistresses, it is better to understand the metaphor as the directing hand of God, a sign of willing obedience. Just as a servant watched every gesture of the master so as to determine his will, so the children of God are always ready to do God's will. St. Paul calls himself a δοῦλος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, meaning that he had no will of his own. He was slave but yet free. Others speak of the supplying hand, the protecting hand, or the correcting hand, all of which do not fit the context too well. In the light of the context, especially of the entire Scripture, we should not interpret the words "until that He have mercy upon us" as if God withheld his mercy until someone has demonstrated he is worthy of it. No, this is the confident waiting upon the Lord. In truth there is no other source of mercy; and if we do not wait upon Jehovah, we shall go away empty. But we know Jehovah's promises and wait in earnest, confident, trusting prayer. This in itself is a wonderful lesson in prayer—perseverance. The beautiful plea "Have mercy upon us, O Lord," is also a New Testament prayer. It is a cry in true repentance for forgiveness in the Savior. The unmerciful Servant uttered such a cry and was forgiven. The Psalmist does not mean that God's people are filled with contempt (v. 3) for others, but that the proud and mighty enemies of the church have filled them with contempt and hatred. The Hebrew verb means "to be saturated" or completely filled. V. 4 expands the thought. "Those that are at ease" means those who are rich and proud and/or feel themselves secure. The Psalm, then, is a picture of the church in the world of opposition and hatred pleading for mercy and confidently knowing that deliverance is sure.

The Theme of the Day.—The preacher will want to connect the thoughts of the text with the church year. The key to the day is forgiveness, especially as this is related to prayer. The Gospel for the day is the parable of the Unmerciful Servant. God's forgiveness is the

incentive for forgiving others, much as God's people in this psalm watch the hand of the Lord for His every will. Forgiven people forgive others. In developing this theme we must, according to the text and the day, treat both forgiveness and prayer.

The Goal and Purpose of the Sermon.—The purpose of the message is to teach the people of God to pray sincerely one of the hardest petitions—"Lord, forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who sin against us." If the pastor wishes to build a praying church, this petition must first be taught, for it is the epitome of love. The implications of sanctification in the Lord's Prayer should be stressed.

Gospel Emphasis in the Sermon.—The entire prayer in the text rests on the fact that Jehovah is a God of mercy who hears prayers and gives His Spirit without measure. V. 3 has been called the constant Kyrie of the believers of all time. There is a great opportunity for preaching Gospel from this text, especially from v. 3 and parallels.

Illustrations and Parallels.—Notice how Paul has connected the Gospel with prayer in the Epistle (Phil. 1:6). Paul is also praying in confidence, and notice that he prays for the church. The pastor will not neglect to use the Gospel and its pointed lesson of forgiveness. Other parallels of the Kyrie may be found in the Scriptures.

Outline

Introduction: Did the people of the Old Testament pray differently from the believers of the New Testament? There may have been differences in outward form and gesture (raising the face to the heavens, while we pray with hands folded and heads bowed), but the Spirit and basis of true prayer is the same for believers of every age.

An Old Testament Psalmist Teaches to Pray

- I. True prayer is directed to proper source (v. 1)
 - A. Not to idols or earthly power.
 - B. But to Him who dwells in the heavens.
- II. True prayer has implicit trust (v. 2)
 - A. In the power of God.
 - B. In His gracious will.
- III. True prayer pleads for mercy (vv. 3, 4)
 - A. Mercy or forgiveness is found in Christ Jesus.
 - B. Mercy is by grace and not by merit.
 - C. Mercy is given without measure.

D. Mercy is basic to true prayer (in Jesus' name).

E. He who has mercy has all other necessary blessings (Rom. 8:32; Luke 5:23, 24).

IV. True prayer implies the obedience of faith (v. 2)

A. The implications of the Lord's Prayer and Gospel of the day.

B. Practical value of prayer for the church.

Springfield, Ill.

LORMAN M. PETERSEN

ST. SIMON AND ST. JUDE

THE APOSTLES' DAY, October 28

EPISTLE: 1 PETER 1:3-9

Questions Incidental to the Day.—1) Why commemorate these two apostles together? "The association of these two apostles may be due to nothing more than their immediate connection in the lists of the apostles in Luke [6:15, 16] and Acts [1:13]. There is a tradition, however, that Simon the Zealot (extreme nationalist) and Jude (identical with Thaddaeus) labored together in Persia and were martyred there on the same day." (Reed, *Lutheran Liturgy*, p. 508.) See also Matt. 10:3, 4; Mark 3:18.—2) Why not an Epistle for the day from the Book of Jude? Probably because of some doubt that that book was written by this Jude.—3) Why 1 Peter 1:3-9? Because it is appropriate. Other suitable passages: Eph. 4:7-13 (Missal), and Eph. 2:19-22 (Prayer Book).

Biography.—1) St. Simon. In the Bible he is mentioned only in the lists of the apostles: Matt. 10:4; Mark 3:18; Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13. To distinguish him from Simon Peter, he is also called "the Canaanite" (from an Aramaic word meaning "zeal") and "Zelotes," or "the Zealot." These names may refer to his zeal for the Jewish Law before his call and conversion to the Christian religion, or they may indicate that he was a member of the Jewish patriotic party called the Zealots. When he became a Christian, knowledge of the truth (John 8:32) was added to his zeal. It is not possible to reconcile the various traditions concerning his life after Pentecost. He was "the companion of St. Jude on many of his missionary tours. . . . The exact manner of [his] death is not told us, but he is generally supposed to have been sawn asunder [the same is said of Isaiah; see also Heb. 11:37] or else beheaded. That he suffered martyrdom is quite certain." (Webber, *Church Symbolism*, pp. 206—208.)—2) St. Jude. He is mentioned in the lists of the

apostles: Luke 6:16 and Acts 1:13 ("Judas, the brother of James"); Matt. 10:4 gives his other names ("Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus"); see also Mark 3:18. "Jude" means "celebrated," or "object of praise"; "Lebbaeus" comes from the Hebrew and Aramaic words for "heart" and may mean "courageous, stouthearted"; "Thaddaeus" comes from an Aramaic word referring to a mother's breast and points to the idea "beloved child." Jude seems to have been quite a likable and outstanding man, even though he cuts no large figure in the pages of the Bible. He may have been a brother of Simon and James the Less and as such a cousin of Jesus. The only other mention of him in the Bible is in John 14:22, where he asks Jesus: "Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us and not unto the world?" The specific answer is in John 14:23-26, calling for love of God and its reflection in life (v. 24) and including the "deep, mysterious, yet wonderfully comforting doctrine of the mystical union of the Ever Blessed Trinity with the individual believer" (Ressel). But it did not end there. The entire following discourse, to the end of John 16, and including some of the most beloved and precious chapters in the entire Bible, was touched off by the question of Jude. See, for example, John 15:26; 16:7, 13-16, 22, 25. The story of his life after Pentecost is as obscure and as uncertain as that of St. Simon. We are told that he was a tireless missionary in Arabia, Syria, and Mesopotamia, traveling far and often with Simon and finally suffering martyrdom with him on the same day in Persia. The exact manner of his death is not known.

A Grammatical Note.—Are ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, "rejoice" (vv. 6 and 8), and ἀγαπᾶτε, "love" (v. 8), imperatives or indicatives? You must decide this for yourself. The verb forms are exactly the same in the Greek. The King James and the Revised Standard versions favor the indicative. But Robertson, in his unabridged grammar, favors the imperative in v. 6 (p. 949). The imperatives might be translated: "Rejoice in this . . ." (v. 6); "Love Him, even though you have not seen Him; and believing in Him whom you do not now see, rejoice . . ." (v. 8).

What Does the Text Say?—This text is pure Gospel. It shows us our Savior Jesus Christ and tells us what God in His mercy has done, still does, and will finally do for our salvation. Luther: "This is now the grand summary of these words: Christ, through His resurrection, has brought us to the Father; and so also Peter would with them bring us to the Father by the Lord Christ, and he sets Him forth as Mediator between God and us. . . . Oh! it is a blessing infinitely vast, bestowed upon us through Christ, that we may go into the presence of the Father

and claim the inheritance of which Peter here speaks." (Lenker's translation, p. 43.)

The text divides easily and naturally into three parts, each of which speak of *saving faith*. On October 28 we commemorate two saints. The Augsburg Confession (Art. 21) says: "The memory of saints may be set before us, that we may follow their *faith* and good works." So we take as our theme: *The Faith of Saints*. For special examples of faith we look on this day to Sts. Simon and Jude. But the word "saints" in the theme includes all who are saved, also the most obscure and unsung among us, who are known only to God (2 Tim. 2:19).

After a brief word of benediction in praise of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, vv. 3 and 4 tell us that the faith of saints is a miracle of God's creative power. It is *He* who "has begotten us again unto a living hope . . . to an inheritance incorruptible. . . ." Luther: "If God produces faith in man, it is certainly as great a work as though he recreated heaven and earth" (on 1 Peter 1:5. Lenker's translation, p. 48). Example: It was God who put faith into the heart of Simon and Jude and made them apostles. Eph. 4:11. — Emphasize: 1) *God* is the Author of saving faith (Heb. 12:2 and Phil. 2:13). Christian faith is not man-made. 2) God's mercy, *ἔλεος*, which is elicited by the misery of man. See Titus 3:5: "According to His mercy He saved us." See also Pieper-Engelder, *Christian Dogmatics*, II, 7, 8. 3) The part which Christ's resurrection plays in this. 1 Cor. 15:14-20! 4) As children of God we look forward to an inheritance which is imperishable, undefiled, and unfading. 5) Our hope is assured of its fulfillment, because our inheritance is "reserved" in heaven, that is, safely guarded and kept; it will surely, definitely, positively be there for us when we leave this life. See Rom. 8:28-39!

The second part of the text (vv. 5-8) tells us that it is God also who *keeps* the saints in faith. — Emphasize: 1) The day-to-day and hour-to-hour miracle of God in continuing faith. If you are a Christian today, it is not because of your own strong character or will power (or "won't" power). See Phil. 1:6. Never fail to appreciate God's personal and direct interest in you! Never forget to thank Him in word and deed and to serve Him in your life for His constant blessings, especially the blessing of faith! Luther: "Faith is a living, busy, active, powerful thing, so that it is impossible that it should not always be doing something good. It does not ask whether good works are to be done, but before one asks, it has done them and is always active in doing them." (Preface to the Epistle to the Romans.) Example: The missionary activity of Sts. Simon and Jude. See also Acts 27:23. 2) Since it is

God who upholds you, all trials of faith which come upon you according to His will, even the most severe, can be endured successfully. Example: The martyrdom of Sts. Simon and Jude. See also Rom. 8:18! In 1 Peter 1:6: on the words "for a season" compare Rev. 6:11; on "if need be" compare 1 Peter 3:17. On "rejoicing in Him" (1 Peter 1:8) compare Hannah in 1 Sam. 2:1. Here is more than love at first sight—here is love without sight! Tennyson:

Strong Son of God, immortal Love,
Whom we, that have not seen Thy face,
By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
Believing, where we cannot prove!

The third part of the text (v.9) tells how God finally rewards the faith of saints. There are overtones here of Luke 21:19: "In your patience possess ye your souls," and of Matt. 10:28 and Luke 12:4, which remind us that persecutors can gain power only over the body. Example: The final suffering of Sts. Simon and Jude was for them the gate to eternal glory. See also Acts 14:22; John 10:27-30! God is the *Finisher* of our faith (Heb. 12:2).

How to Preach on This Text.—Luther: "We must preach Jesus Christ, that He died and rose again and why He died and rose again, that through such preaching men might believe on Him and be saved. That is preaching the true Gospel. Whatever is not preached in this manner is not Gospel, and it matters not who does it." (Sub loc., Lenker's translation, pp. 42, 43.)

Outline

The Faith of Saints

1. Created by God (vv. 3, 4)
2. Preserved by God (vv. 5-8)
3. Rewarded by God (v. 9)

See the above exposition for further subdivisions.

(NOTE: This is the eighth and last in the current series of studies on the Epistles of the minor festivals, begun in this journal December 1953. The author regrets that the editors cannot find sufficient space in the pages of the CTM to continue and possibly complete the series.)

Pitcairn, Pa.

LUTHER POELLOT

BRIEF STUDIES

JOHN GERHARD ON PHILOSOPHY IN THEOLOGY

EDITORIAL NOTE: On June 4, 1956, the day before the close of the academic school year, the faculty and students of Concordia Seminary, as well as many others, gathered in the Chapel for the funeral service of the writer of this article. Donald Meyer was not thirty years old and had not completed his first year as an instructor in philosophy at our seminary when the Lord called a sudden halt to his labors. Human observation and evaluation predicted a long and useful career in his teaching ministry. He was of a keen mind, studious, devout, modest, amiable, apt to teach. But God perfected his knowing in part into the perfect epistemology of seeing Him face to face who had redeemed him. This short study had been prepared by him shortly before illness struck him. We lay it as a wreath to his memory.

In the period of Lutheran Orthodoxy in the seventeenth century the great theologians were writing elaborate systematic theologies which they called *Loci*. Because of the systematic nature of the task they had to consider carefully the relationship between philosophy and theology. Perhaps the greatest of these theologians was Johann Gerhard, whose *Loci theologici* had a great deal of influence upon later Lutheran theology. In a small book called *Methodus studii theologici* he makes a careful study of the use and abuse of philosophy in theology.

The library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, has a copy of this book, published in 1654. It has as its general purpose to consider the education of the theologian. The discussion of philosophy comes in a section which treats of the propaedeutic to theology in two parts of equal length. The first is on the study of the Biblical languages; the second deals with philosophy.

There are three parts or chapters to the section on philosophy. The first chapter deals with "the multiplex and salutary use of philosophy," the second with the abuse of philosophy in theology, the third on the aids of philosophic studies.

The first chapter begins with the statement that there are three uses of philosophy in theology, the *usus ὀργανικός, κατασκευαστικός*, and *ἀνασκευαστικός*. The *usus organicus* is philosophy used as a tool. There are two parts to philosophy, Gerhard says, the instrumental, which includes grammar, rhetoric, and logic (the medieval trivium), and the real or theoretical, which includes metaphysics, physics, mathematics, politics, ethics, and economics.

There are three considerations with regard to these. First, both the

instrumental and the real parts of philosophy may help in the training of the mind of the theologian. "The knowledge of them stimulates, sharpens, prepares, and perfects the human mind so that in any situation whatever the study of the profound disciplines can progress more expeditiously and with less labor."

Second, the real may help in the explication of terms. The theologian uses two kinds of terms: first, Biblical terms, which are simply derived from a reading of Scriptures, and, secondly, what he calls ecclesiastical terms. Ecclesiastical terms are such as do not appear in Scriptures, although the thought which they are intended to express does occur in Scriptures. Philosophy helps to give a more accurate explication of such terms. From metaphysics we may derive such terms as *being*, *good*, *truth*, *perfection*, *finitude*, *infinite*, *person*, *existence*, *essence*, *act*, *potency*. From physics one may get accurate descriptions of such terms as *time*, *place*, *void*, *degree*; from politics, *law* and *freedom*.

Gerhard observes that because philosophy serves in the explication of terms, it is not a master but a minister, serving and not ruling. Furthermore, it is necessary that the theologian explicate the term farther than did philosophy, to accommodate it to his purpose, to free it from imperfection, and to enter it properly into theology. As one example he gives the word *justice*. The use of the word in philosophical ethics is somewhat different from its use in theology. Nevertheless, philosophy may help in the accurate explication of the term.

Third, the instrumental part of philosophy may also help the theologian. Logic he divides into four parts: definition, division, or distinction, method, and argument. Logic may help the theologian present his material clearly and orderly, to state controversies lucidly, to confirm them with clarity, and to refute the adversaries. Rhetoric helps the theologian through the explication of figures and tropes.

The second general use of philosophy Gerhard calls by the Greek word *κατασκολαστικός*. This use might be called the "confirmatory." Some questions cannot be confirmed through any use of reason, for they concern the highest mysteries of faith. Such are the mysteries of the Trinity, of incarnation, of resurrection. However, there are some questions which can be answered through the human intellect, which knows that God exists, that God is good, just, and that He punishes the wicked. The first kind of questions philosophy must ignore. However, philosophy may help to clarify them through supplying illustrations, but must not try to explain them fully. With regard to the second kind of question, the arguments of philosophy are not

presented as if the truths of theology were not sufficient, but in a kind of secondary way, only to state that they are apparent also from the light of nature.

The third general use of philosophy, which Gerhard calls ἀπολογιστικός and which might be called "apologetic," is a negative use. It serves to refute false rational arguments. Almost the whole of this section is given to a quotation from Chapter 5 of Luther's *On Monastic Vows*. Translated from Gerhard's quotation, it reads: "Nature does not extend by itself to the light and work of God; in affirmative statements it provides false judgments, but in negatives it is certain. For reason cannot seize what God is, but what He is not. It does not, then, see what is right and good before God (faith only), but it does know clearly infidelity and that homicide is evil. This even Christ used when he said that every kingdom divided against itself shall fall. . . ."

There are three abuses of philosophy parallel to the three uses. The first abuse relates to the function of philosophy as a tool. One may, first of all, be so taken up with philosophical matters that the concerns of faith are forgotten. Second, in the use of terms derived from philosophy the influence of philosophy may be too great, and such important terms as *justification* may get a changed meaning. Or, finally, logic may become too important, and the theologians may rely upon logic rather than upon the articles of faith to state the truth.

There are four possible abuses related to arguments which confirm. First, one may attempt to prove the mysteries of faith. Secondly, a theologian may postpone testimony from Scripture as though philosophic arguments were more certain than Scriptural sayings. Third, the theologian may make the mistake of judging faith as established and confirmed by philosophy. Fourthly, in mixed questions, when one term is philosophic and the other theological (or one ecclesiastical and the other Biblical), the theologian may make the mistake of attempting to find confirming arguments from philosophy. Such a statement would be, "The body of Christ is in one place."

Finally, there are several abuses possible under the general category of apologetic. First, axioms of philosophy may be accepted as genuine truths applicable in every instance to religion. Such an abuse would be if one said that ubiquity must be denied to Christ because it countermands a law of physics.

Secondly, when a judgment involving the mysteries of faith looks like a contradiction, the theologian may make the mistake of com-

mitting this to human reason. All divine mysteries are above human reason. With regard to some, for example, resurrection, the possibility of its truth is seen. With regard to others, the mystery of the Trinity, for example, not even the possibility is perceptible. The theologian must remember that the contradiction arises because of the limitations of the human mind. There is no contradiction on God's part.

In the final portion of the entire section of philosophy there is a paragraph under the title "On Aids in the Study of Philosophy." Noteworthy there is the comment that the study of Aristotle ought to be preferred to others, first, because of the superiority of his *ratio philosophandi*, secondly, because, in order to argue well against the adversaries of the Christian faith, who employed the Aristotelian terminology, one must use their formulations.

At least one comment seems appropriate at seeing Gerhard's position. We may ask the question whether this position is the one which a Lutheran theologian must always take. It is obvious that Luther did not have the respect for Aristotle that Gerhard had and most certainly did not use the Aristotelian distinctions and method to present his theology. Nevertheless there is a method in Luther's writing, as any careful reading will reveal. There are, furthermore, distinctions and terms which are not strictly Biblical which Luther found useful in presenting his thought. Even without examining Luther in detail on this matter, it seems likely that in him there was conceived a different relationship between theology and the instrumental use of philosophy. At least, theology in the form in which he wanted to write it seemed to demand a different use of the nontheological, the mental, the formal.

The Lutheran tradition seems, then, to have at least two positions on the use of philosophy in theology—that of Luther and that of Gerhard and perhaps also of his contemporaries. If there is no material difference between the two, then it would seem that theologians might differ in the form of their theology and in their terminology without differing in meaning. It might also mean that theologians can argue both with regard to the thought they are communicating and with regard to the form or language by which their thought is communicated. The first is a legitimate enterprise for one interested in the truth of the matter. The second is not. It would, then, seem important to know the terminology to understand the theologian, but that one cannot criticize him because of a particular way of stating the truth.

DONALD P. MEYER †

HUMANISTIC PEDAGOGY UNCHASTENED BY EXPERIENCE

Late last year a little brochure* was published in Germany, consisting of quotations from the works of Johannes Heinrich Pestalozzi, supplemented by a few quotations from Wilhelm Schaefer's *Lebenstag eines Menschenfreundes* and by six pages of the compiler's introduction. This small German booklet will be read by comparatively few Americans, but it can serve as a take-off for a brief discussion of the unfounded and damaging optimism of naturalistic and idealistic humanism in education.

The compiler of this little volume succeeds in providing therein another eulogy of the genial, selfless, self-sacrificing, and altruistic Pestalozzi, but he succeeds also in revealing (unintentionally?) the naturalistic and idealistic humanism from which Pestalozzi suffered and which characterized his educational theory and practice.

In the introduction the compiler speaks with unqualified approval of Pestalozzi's enchantment with "humanity and education for humanity," of his "belief in the good in man," of his "great and broad goal of the perfected humanity, the genuine *humanitas*," and of his confidence in the inherent powers of man to implant the love of God and man in his own heart and to bring happiness and blessing into his home.

Here, then, is the gigantic idea of the morally autonomous, free man—the perfect man. Here is naturalistic, idealistic humanism whose educational anthropocentrism crowds out educational theocentrism or Christocentrism. Here is pre-World War enthusiasm for, and faith in, this kind of education as the supreme instrument for saving man from misery and prostration. Here is a reaching out to the stars of salvation through an education for which "nothing is impossible." Here breathes the spirit of Rousseau and his theme of *retourner à la nature*. Here is the never-ceasing endeavor of man to leapfrog over his own shadows of sin and spiritual impotence. Here is human Titanism at work.

Pestalozzi was indeed a man of loving and warm heart, but he was in reality a man warmly confused—a man of his time, the age of reason and enlightenment. Influenced by Rousseau's dogma that man is by nature good, the genial Pestalozzi began his promotion of the emerging humanistic pedagogy as an outspoken optimist (*Abend-*

* *Lasst uns unsern Kindern leben: J. H. Pestalozzi, seine Botschaft und sein Leben*. Selected and edited by Richard Kik. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1955. 68 pages. Boards. DM 2.00.

stunde eines Einsiedlers, 1780), going so far as to write: "Believe in yourself, O Man, and you believe in God and immortality." Largely because of his faith in man, modern humanists have assigned to Pestalozzi a prominent place among the great modern educators. However, in his *Leonard and Gertrude* (1782) there begins to appear a fairly clear line of demarcation between good and evil persons, though the optimism concerning man's natural goodness and his desire to be good still prevails. But in his later gripping volume *Gesetzgebung und Kindermord* Pestalozzi can no longer escape the conviction that there is a "higher" and a "lower" nature of man which determines the development of his character and life. Finally, after the French Revolution, comes the confession from his lips that man, individually and collectively, is by nature evil and cannot be otherwise. The "higher" nature is in man, but it is not an immediate possession of man and of human society. Pestalozzi started out as an optimist, but in the end he became a pessimist, uncertain and confused. In his first volume Pestalozzi raised and proposed to answer the question concerning the nature of man. But what were the findings of the matured, experienced Pestalozzi? They are seldom recorded in histories of education, certainly not in the fulsome eulogies of Pestalozzi. Largely disillusioned and frustrated, Pestalozzi delivered his famous New Year's address of 1808 while standing next to his own empty coffin on the platform, and he said: "Behold my coffin! What remains for me? The hope of my grave. . . . Here I stand. Here is my coffin. Here is my consolation. . . . I behold before my own eyes the skeleton of my work, insofar as it is my work."

Naturalistic and idealistic humanism in education is not dead. It seems to emerge in postwar periods of human misery and despair. After the Persian wars it flowered out in Plato's idealism. After the Napoleonic wars it was revived in the philosophy of Fichte and others. Now, after World Wars I and II, it manifests a new lease on life and, unchastened by experience, it can say as in the *Humanist Manifesto* of 1933: "Man is at last becoming aware that he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams and that he has within himself the power for its achievement. He must set intelligence and will to the task"—after, of course, having discarded supernatural religion and guarantees. Today, as ever, this humanism is chauvinistically optimistic about human nature and human perfectibility and human autonomy in education.

A. G. MERKENS

LIK

I

cor

Car

inte

Lut

his

to

beg

a n

goi

turn

to

If

put

tak

Am

son

goo

prin

skil

to e

giam

of v

The

hav

are

thre

The

ELO

U

195

a fa

a ph

Spra

the

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

LIKE COMING OUT INTO THE FRESH AIR

In his review of *Luther's Works: Selected Psalms I* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, Vol. XII) Dr. W. R. Cannon, dean of the Candler School of Theology of Emory University (Georgia), writes *inter alia* in *Religion in Life* (Summer 1956): "The thought of Martin Luther is scarcely less important than his work. . . . After Luther did his gigantic work on earth, the spirit of that work lived and continued to operate in the lives of his followers through the great ideas he bequeathed to posterity. Those same ideas operate today in as effective a manner as they operated during the sixteenth century. It is like going out into fresh air after a long stay in a stuffy room when we turn away from the complex expressions of contemporary theology to the clear, candid, straightforward speech of this great theologian. If one should try to rank Luther, theologically speaking, one would put him in the first category of the thinkers of all times. Luther would take his place side by side with Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Calvin. Among Protestant minds there is none greater than Luther. I personally am glad that the Press released Volume XII first. That is as good an introduction to Luther as I know anything about. Luther, primarily, was a preacher. Here you have an example of his preaching skill at its very best. Therefore, exposition is the proper door to open to enter into an acquaintance with the thinking of the sixteenth-century giant. . . . In each one of his treatments Doctor Luther uses the method of verse-by-verse exposition. Look at the second psalm, for example. There is an entire sermon under each verse. A modern preacher would have in Psalm 2 a whole series of evening messages, as many as there are verses in the psalm. . . . These volumes will come out, two or three a year, for the next several years. Every minister should own them. They should be a part of any theologically minded person's library."

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

ELOHIM AND ELOAH

Under this heading Norman Walker, in *Vetus Testamentum* (April 1956), suggests that אלהים after all may have been a singular noun, a fact which the Masoretes misunderstood, so that they pointed it as a plural. He writes: "A. Jirku ('Die Mimation in den Nord-semitischen Sprachen,' *Biblica*, XXXIV [1953], pp. 78—80) has shown that in the West-Semitic Dialects of Palestine-Syria, during the first third of

the second millennium B. C., nine place names and one personal name were mimated and ended in —m, but that between 1800—1500 B. C. this mimation fell away both among the West-Semites and in Babylonia. Generalizing from these instances, he supposes that certain words in Hebrew, pointed in the M. T. [Masoretic text] as though plurals, like Teraphim, Urim, Tummim, and Sanwerim, and yet treated as singulars, are in reality mimated singulars left over in Canaanite and taken over by Hebrew. This makes one wonder whether after all אֱלֹהִים, where it signifies 'God' as distinct from 'gods,' is really a mimated singular. If so, this would account for the late appearance of the unmiminated form 'elōah. The difference between singular and plural masculine nouns must originally have lain not in the final —m, but in the length of the last vowel, so that 'God' was 'elōhim, but 'gods' 'elōhim. The M. T. confuses the two, of which the former should properly be אֱלֹהִים as against the latter אֱלֹהִים." If this principle of mimation may be accepted as true in the case of אֱלֹהִים; then its bearing on exegetical inferences may not be insignificant. Luther, for example, believed that the plural name for God אֱלֹהִים used with the singular of the verb, is a link in a long and strong chain of evidences and points out the Holy Trinity in the O. T. Mimation in this case would eliminate such sort of reasoning."

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

PAUL HUTCHINSON, EDITOR

Paul Hutchinson was managing editor of the *Christian Century* from 1924 to 1947 and editor from 1947 to 1956. He died quite suddenly in the Baptist hospital at Beaumont, Tex., at the age of 66 years (April 10, 1890—April 15, 1956). The April 25 issue of the *Christian Century* offers tributes to the deceased from various members of the editorial staff, a former fellow missionary of his in China, and his pastor in Evanston, Ill. They are for the greater part brief, sober, and moderate, emphasizing points of character and personality to which also a Biblical theologian may agree, at least so far as he could judge Dr. Hutchinson from his many literary contributions to his periodical. But they frankly point out also the line of divergence between liberal theology and traditional Christian theology. Charles Clayton Morrison writes of him: "For theology he had only a secondary interest." Halford E. Luccock (Simeon Stylites) says: "Paul Hutchinson's spirit is well expressed in his own words, written just thirty years ago. Writing of the church he said: 'The church has had its hours of conformity, of regularity, of walking in well-marked roads. But these have not been the high hours. Whenever the moment comes

when the church is ready to break the trammels of convention, to forsake the trodden paths, to mount again for some new circuit through some new wilderness, or along some new border, then it comes aflame once more." His pastor, Harold A. Bosley, put this into his tribute: "Paul Hutchinson was a ready and willing fighter for freedom of thought and speech. He gloried in the freedom of the pulpit of our church." All these expressions witness to the deep tragedy of liberalism in its abysmal ignorance of Christ's theological directive: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31, 32).

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

NEW PROOF FOR THE HISTORICAL DEPENDABILITY OF THE BIBLE

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly (April 1956) reports, on the basis of a news item in the *New York Times* (February 1956), the successful deciphering of a Neo-Babylonian cuneiform tablet recording important events between 626—594 B.C. The clay tablet was translated by Dr. D. J. Wiseman of the British Museum, who will soon publish the version with a commentary. Dr. W. F. Albright, who for several years has been in communication with Dr. Wiseman, shares the discoverer's enthusiasm, as the report says. The tablet gives a contemporary account of the siege of Jerusalem in 597 by Nebuchadnezzar, the capture and deportation of King Jehoiachin (cf. 2 Kings 24:8-16), and the appointment of his uncle Zedekiah as king. The tablet recounts "many of the main political and religious events between 626 and 594 B.C.," e.g., the battle of Carchemish in 605 and some previously unknown happenings, as, for example, a battle in 601 in which the Egyptians defeated the Babylonians. More complete and authoritative information on this tablet is to be given in future issues of the *CBQ*.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

WE HAVE NO REASON TO LOSE COURAGE

The Christian Century (April 25, 1956) publishes the "last public words of Paul Hutchinson," late editor of the periodical just named. From April 10 to 12 of this year, according to the report, he gave the C. I. Jones Memorial Lectures at Rayne Memorial Methodist Church in New Orleans, speaking on the theme "The Churches in the Crisis of These Times." According to Rev. A. M. Serex, the minister of the church, Dr. Hutchinson concluded his lectures with the following words, which were to be his last public message: "What I have been saying these days has had behind it a hope that it may

help some of you to see the gravity of the position in which the church finds itself in this hour. But it has not been brought forward as a cause for discouragement, complacency, a superficial optimism, contentment with the traditional and the routine. These are states of mind we need to get rid of. But we have no reason to lose courage. We have a gospel which is the word of life. We have a Lord and Master who is the answer to men's needs. We have a fighting chance. What more can we ask?" We can only conjecture what Dr. Hutchinson meant by "contentment with the traditional" as "a state of mind we need to get rid of." If by the phrase he meant adherence to the Biblical truth, then no conservative believer is able to share his view, for he certainly is eager to continue in Christ's Word (John 8:31, 32). However, just because of that fact he repeats the last sentences of Dr. Hutchinson with divine confidence and courage: "We have no reason to lose courage. We have a Gospel which is the Word of life. We have a Lord and Master who is the answer to men's needs. We have a fighting chance. What more can we ask?"

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

Munich, Germany.—Lutheran Bishop Hans Meiser of Munich, one of Germany's best-known Protestant churchmen, died here of heart failure at the age of 75. He had retired from active episcopal duties and the chairmanship of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany (VELKD) in May of last year. Bishop Meiser was largely responsible for the establishment of the VELKD, in which ten of the 13 regional Lutheran Churches in East and West Germany are consolidated. Its membership of over 18,000,000 comprises nearly half the number of Protestants in Germany.

Prominently identified with ecumenical bodies, such as the Lutheran World Federation and the World Council of Churches, Bishop Meiser visited the United States in 1936 and 1948. He was pastor of the Home Mission in his native town of Nuremberg, 1911—15, and of St. Matthew's Church in Munich, 1915—22. In 1933 he returned to Nuremberg to direct the newly founded preachers' seminary there. He was elected a bishop in 1933.

A vigorous opponent of the Hitler regime, Bishop Meiser was credited with having made the Lutheran Church of Bavaria one of the main resistance groups against the Nazis. In 1955 he was awarded the Great Cross, highest class of the Order of Merit of the West Germany Federal Republic, by President Theodore Heuss.

Omaha, Nebr.—By an overwhelming vote the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches approved a proposed merger with the Evangelical and Reformed Church in 1957.

The action came after an extraordinary all-night session brought about by the bitter opposition of an antimerger minority. In an effort to block the merger, opponents proposed that the minutes of executive committee meetings during the last two years be read. This was ordered when the opponents contended that a summary did not reveal all the facts. Sixteen ministers took turns reading the voluminous reports for a period of nine and a half hours. Then, after further discussion, the delegates voted 1,314 to 101 in favor of a resolution approving the report of the executive committee, which included plans for the proposed union. The vote meant approval of everything the executive committee had done toward bringing about the merger.

A second enabling resolution authorized the calling of the first General Synod of the new United Church of Christ at Cleveland, June 25—27, and elected those nominated as delegates to the synod meeting. The vote on this resolution was 1,310 for, 179 against, and 11 abstaining. Immediately after passage of the enabling legislation, the delegates approved without opposition another resolution calling upon the General Synod of the United Church of Christ to keep the door open for any dissenting church after union had been accomplished. The resolution expressed deep grief for any break in the communion.

Meanwhile there were indications that new legal battles might loom over the approved merger. Spokesmen for the antimerger faction made it clear that some local churches were determined to "preserve their traditions" to the point of litigation. One leader of this movement, the Rev. Malcolm Burton of Pontiac, Mich., said that although no legal action was contemplated in the near future, this did not mean that such action could not be carried through later.

The Evangelical and Reformed Church is scheduled to discuss the merger at its biennial convention starting August 31 at Lancaster, Pa.

The proposed new church, with 2,000,000 congregants, will rank as the seventh largest Protestant body in the country. It has been under consideration for 14 years.

A basis of union was adopted by the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church in 1948. Merger was delayed, however, by litigation initiated in 1950 by the Cadman Memorial Church of Brooklyn, N. Y., which contested the right of the denomination's General Council to effect it. The Brooklyn church was supported by a national Committee for the Continuation of Congre-

gational Christian Churches. In March 1954 the New York State Court of Appeals brought the long litigation to an end by denying a rehearing of its decision upholding the merger.

The following October the executive bodies of the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church met in Cleveland, Ohio, and approved the merger plan. Last June top officials of both Churches, at a meeting in Columbus, Ohio, set the merger date for June 25—27, 1957, in Cleveland.

Washington, D. C.—A stamp issued by the Saar depicting Albrecht Dürer's famous painting "Praying Hands" was selected for the first annual award of the Collectors of Religion on Stamps Society (COROS). It was cited as the most outstanding 1955 religious design.

Albany, N. Y.—Declaring that obscene literature "fosters crime" the United Lutheran Synod of New York and New England directed its social missions committee to study how best to "educate" the membership concerning the evil. Delegates to the synod's 28th annual meeting also urged the commission, as well as ministers and laymen, to express their concern over the situation to "members of the appropriate legislative bodies."

Strong opposition to penalizing ministers who participate in the social-security program by reducing their pensions was voiced in another adopted resolution.

Chicago.—Walther League youth caravans sponsored by the Board for Young People's Work of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod will visit 163 congregations in the United States and Canada between June 18 and August 13. Each of the 11 groups will comprise three young people who are from 16 to 21 years old and have volunteered their summer vacation time to "alert congregations and youth groups to the terrific potential in modern Christian youth work" as represented in the Walther League program.

The Rev. Elmer N. Witt, executive secretary of the League, said it is hoped the caravans will "help highlight the need for stimulating youth programs in our congregations."

The 33 young people selected for the caravans were chosen from among more than 900 volunteers. All of them have attended one or more Lutheran Service Volunteer schools. Before departing on the eight-week project, they will have completed a two-month correspondence course in youth-work techniques and a four-day briefing session at Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

KERYGMA UND MYTHOS, ed. Hans-Werner Bartsch. Vol. IV: *Die ökumenische Diskussion*. 238 pages. Vol. V: *Die Theologie Bultmanns und die Entmythologisierung in der Kritik der katholischen Theologie*. 172 pages. Hamburg-Volksdorf: Herbert Reich-Evangelischer Verlag, 1955. Paper. DM 10,00 per volume.

Here are 16 essays, all in the German language, on Bultmann's "demythologizing" theory clamoring to be reviewed. To come to grips with any one of them would be a sizable problem; but to wrestle with 16 may seem to be courting inevitable disaster. Yet the reviewing is not as difficult as it may seem. The essays fall into three classes: those that condemn, as do all the Roman Catholic ones, those that damn with faint, or somewhat generous, praise; and those that, at least chiefly, approve. While the discussions move on a high and extremely scholarly level, I came upon at least one humorous touch when an essayist reported on the literary debate between Bultmann and Stauffer. In answer to the latter's strictures, Bultmann replied that he thought the two of them might arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement, namely, that he, Bultmann, did not know anything about *Realtheologie* (sponsored by Stauffer), while Stauffer was equally innocent of what was signified by "demythologizing" (IV, 34). Another initial note. The reader may find Bultmann's position difficult to fathom. For his and my own consolation, I quote here a remark of Karl Barth's (adverted to IV, 119), who, after saying that he has attempted to understand Bultmann and fears that he has failed, adds: "I have the impression that many, in fact, most people do not know more of this matter than I and merely act as if they knew all about it."

All essayists are of the opinion that Bultmann's often expressed objective to make the Christian Gospel message relevant for the modern man is laudable and, in fact, necessary. "The translation of the New Testament message into the present time and for the thinking of the man living here and now is a never-ending task, the task to preach the Gospel ever anew, a task which constitutes the permanent impulse of theological endeavors as well as the concern and worry of preaching" (V, 39). Is there anyone that disagrees? The great question, of course, is whether the method he has chosen, that of "demythologizing," is the proper one. One of the essayists, J. B. Soucek of Prague, sympathetically gives this account of the aims of Bultmann: (1) He wishes to put into practice the often-enunciated principle that religion and science are two different spheres; (2) he tries to make religion relevant for the modern

man with his definitely scientific outlook; (3) he desires to make his theology one which is "from faith to faith" (Rom. 1:17) and which as such avoids mere intellectualism (IV, 29).

Precisely what Bultmann means by "demythologizing" is stated with desirable clarity by the Roman Catholic contributors. They are spectators rather than participants in the strife caused by Bultmann and feel the need of thorough orientation; from them, though they have their presuppositions, we can expect a fairly objective report. Bultmann, so says the Louvain theologian J. de Fraine, submits an interpretation of the Christian message which frees this message of "mythological" ideas contained in it. Matters eliminated by his exegesis are: "The virgin birth of Jesus, the fact that he is God's only-begotten Son, the miracles of the NT, the existence of demons and devils, the descent into hell, the resurrection of Jesus as a real, historical event, and His ascension and His eschatological return, the bodily resurrection of all men, and the new heaven and the new earth" (V, 60). Another writer reminds us that among the things which Bultmann designates as mythological are the teaching of the atoning value of Christ's death, of the work of the Holy Spirit as taught by St. Paul, and of the efficacy of the Sacraments (V, 104). In brief, the modern man, so Bultmann says, no longer believes in the possibility of miracles. Hence whatever belongs to that category must be eliminated, or as Bultmann would say, be given a different interpretation.

If I stopped here in describing Bultmann's position everybody would have to say that the professor of Marburg is simply one of the old rationalists come back to life, as wickedly radical as any one of them ever dared to be. But what has been stated is only one half of the story. Bultmann says what he tries to do is to make the Gospel "existential" for the modern man. What does that mean? He claims to favor the existentialism of the famous philosopher Heidegger in Freiburg and in adopting some of the latter's fundamental ideas Bultmann maintains that the purpose of the Gospel is not chiefly to give us information on miraculous events in the past, but to make us understand the problem of our human existence. He asserts that especially the message of the Cross of Jesus has a meaning for us today which is truly existential, vital, and important because it assures us of the love of God and His forgiving grace. The main thing, so he avers, is not the historical fact of the crucifixion (which he acknowledges), but the *kerygma*, the message of the crucifixion which confronts us with the demand for a decision.

It might be good to set down some of the thoughts of Karl Adam, the well-known Roman Catholic professor of theology at Tübingen, who has furnished a delightfully written and intrinsically valuable contribution to this symposium (V, 103—119). The title of his essay is "The Problem of Demythologizing." Bultmann, says Adam, brushes aside as mythological all the transcendental events enumerated in the Creeds, among them the bodily resurrection of Jesus. But Bultmann differs from the old rationalists

in that he considers Christianity not as a perfectly natural religious movement, but as a one-time saving act of God in Christ. He maintains that men must cease to rely on "flesh" and surrender entirely to the divine word of forgiving grace. While after his fashion he teaches *sola fide* and *sola gratia*, his teaching on God's sovereignty is more Calvinistic than Lutheran. (It should be recalled, this reviewer would observe at this point, that Bultmann has for decades been known as a Barthian.) The resurrection of Christ, as Adam understands Bultmann, must not be viewed as an historical event which proves that Jesus is the heaven-sent Messiah. It is simply a part of the *kerygma* and must be given an existential interpretation. It has an eschatological meaning for us in that when it is proclaimed together with the death of Christ, it is meant to make us here and now decide to accept the message of God's love in Christ. (Eschatology here, this reviewer would again observe, has a different meaning from that which we usually give it, in as far as for Bultmann there is no eschatology in the sense of our dogmatics; the age in which a person lives is for him the eschatological age, that of vital decision. Bultmann holds that the eschatology of the New Testament is part of its mythological warp and woof, and we must not be so naive as to take it literally, but we must interpret it existentially.) What a chasm, Adam points out, separates Bultmann from St. Paul, whose theology he wishes to follow. For St. Paul the resurrection of Christ was a definite, divine and blessed historical fact as is especially evident from 1 Corinthians 15. This, too, was the conviction of the original Apostles. Were they deceived? This raises the old question whether God's intervention in history can ever be proved. In this area belief will always have to face unbelief. For the Apostles of Christ the resurrection was a well-authenticated, historical event, and they preached it as such for the acceptance of their hearers. It was, of course, more than a mere historical event for them; for Christ's life meant their life.

In his discussion of the historical reality of the resurrection of our Lord, Adam shows convincingly that this triumphant event indeed has existential significance and that it is relevant for the modern man as well as it was for the Apostles. He points out that in this event Jesus meets us as our Lord and Savior, as truly existing and living, to whose loving hands we can without hesitation entrust our presence and our future.

There is a final shot in Karl Adam's essay. Does Bultmann himself avoid everything that according to his terminology has to be called mythological? Does he eliminate altogether the supernatural? How about his emphasis on the Gospel as proclaiming the forgiving love of God! Does not that, too, belong to the realm of the invisible, taking us into the areas where modern scientific approach is impossible?

This review must stop here; otherwise it will become unmercifully long. I hope it has given the reader an inkling of the nature of the

tremendous debate about Bultmann which continues in the world of Biblical scholarship at present and which has to do with the all-important question, Is the Christianity of our Creeds true or not?

WILLIAM F. ARNDT

GREGORII NYSSENI OPERA ASCETICA, eds. Werner Jaeger, John P. Cavaros, and Virginia Woods Callahan. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952. 416 pages. Cloth. 30.— guilders.

The latest critical edition of the great Christian Platonist, St. Gregory of Nyssa, whose *Contra Eunomium* Jaeger edited in 1921 and whose letters George Pasquali edited in 1925, takes another step forward in the publication within two covers (designated as Part One of Volume VIII) of *Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ θεὸν σκοποῦ καὶ τῆς κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἀσκήσεως* (*De instituto Christiano*), *Περὶ τοῦ τί τὸ τοῦ Χριστιανοῦ ἐπάγγελμα* (*De professione Christiana*), and *Περὶ τελειότητος* (*De perfectione*), all edited by Jaeger, *Περὶ παρθενίας* (*De virginitate*), edited by Cavaros, and *Εἰς τὸν βίον τῆς ὁσίας Μακρίνης* (*Vita Sanctae Macrinae*), edited by Mrs. Callahan, in a book that does credit to the editors, the sponsoring Institute for Classical Studies at Harvard, and the publishers. The most exciting part of the book is, of course, the first treatise, which is to all intents and purposes a newly discovered work of which previous editions provided nothing more than a "miserable excerpt" (as the Neoclassical Latin preface describes it). In addition to giving us a philologically sound text, Jaeger has also settled in apparently definitive fashion the mystery of the relation between this treatise and the patchwork "Great Letter" of Pseudo-Macarius of Egypt (namely, that both the "miserable excerpt" and the second part of the "Great Letter," of which the first part, as Dörries has shown, is also spurious, are independent reworkings of the original treatise here reproduced). The theology of the treatise is marked by a basic optimism about the goodness of man (the post-Augustinian West would have called it Semi-Pelagian), by the conception of a γνῶσις superior to πίστις by which the soul can ascend to the transcendent God and by the conviction that monastic asceticism is the true φιλοσοφία. The second work is a treatise written late in the saint's life in the form of a letter to a young friend, Harmonius, in which he shows his Platonizing bent by proving that Christianity is the assimilation of the Christian to the divine nature (which is precisely what Plato defines as ἀρετή). The third treatise, seemingly written even later, has a strongly Christological tone from his inquiry into the significance of the names which the Sacred Scriptures give to our Lord, but the basic thesis is stated in the opening sentence, which equates perfection with "a life according to virtue." Special interest attaches to the treatise on virginity, since the author was himself married; for him virginity is a quality of the soul by which the soul binds together the world of man and the world of God, who is Absolute and Perfect Virginity. The biography of St. Macrina is a charming account of the life

of his paternal grandmother, in whom St. Gregory sees the ascetic ideal embodied.—The prefaces and apparatus are models of precise textual scholarship. The separate work that Jaeger promises a number of times in this volume has since appeared (Werner Jaeger, *Two Recently Discovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954]).

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

OTHERWORLDLINESS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Amos N. Wilder. New York: Hapter and Co., 1956. 124 pages. Cloth. \$1.75.

Harvard Divinity School's new professor of New Testament interpretation voices a profound concern in this book's four chapters—each a lecture in either the Perkins School of Theology's Jackson lectures or Yale Divinity School's Schaffer lectures. The concern is the unhappy justification that exists for the charge made by Christians (especially laymen) and pagans alike that the Christian religion is "otherworldly, escapist and irrelevant to the problems of this life" (p. 6). Orthodoxy, Neo-orthodoxy, and Liberalism alike are culpable. This ought not to be so, poet-theologian Wilder explains. The "mythopoetic images" that the men of the Bible used "should be read as such and not translated into prose nor displaced from their original setting without great circumspection" (p. 9). His vehement condemnation of idealism, private Christianity, false spirituality and false asceticism; his insistent stress upon the basic unity of man and the bonds that link him with nature, family, and clan; his scathing criticism of "devout" religious painting; his italicized conviction that "*the Bible will take care of itself*"; his acute analysis of the shortcomings of the early historical critics; his neat tagging of the subtle drift toward docetism that perennially haunts Christianity; his reminder that "the words and images of the New Testament have become empty for many" and are no longer "like banners or fuses" (p. 95)—all these are warnings for every theologian and preacher to take to heart. Lutherans in particular need to think soberly on them, even while noting with regret the absence of some important affirmations that they regard as integral both to "the Resurrection faith" and "a relevant salvation."—Extra "e's" have made a habit of creeping in: Both references to the composer Aaron Copland call him "Copeland" (pp. 26 and 30) and Ernst Lohmeyer has become "Lohemeyer" (p. 114, n. 11).

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

HANDBOOK OF DENOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES.

By Frank S. Mead. Revised edition. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 255 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

Mead's comprehensive and succinct description of the religious bodies of this country, first published in 1951, is here offered in an improved and enlarged form. Historical developments since the publication of the first edition are duly chronicled. The bibliographies—in connection with which Mead acknowledges his indebtedness to the first edition of the late

Frederick E. Mayer's *The Religious Bodies of America* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954) — have been brought up to 1954. The statistics are as of 1953, as far as the information for this year was available. The list of headquarters of denominations and the very complete index add to the book's value.

The basic objective of the book remains unchanged. It is no comparative symbolics. Mead purposed to produce "not a book of opinion, criticism, or value judgments, but a reference volume interested only in factual truth and in the development of the religious bodies of the United States" (p. 8). Likewise unchanged is the basic organization of the book; denominational "families" are listed in alphabetical order, from Adventists to United Brethren, while individual denominations that do not fit conveniently into a "family," from the African Orthodox Church to the Volunteers of America, are integrated into the same single alphabet. Sometimes the "families" are a little too inclusive, as when, for instance, the rubric "Eastern Orthodox Churches" is made to include, along with the denominations in communion with historic Orthodoxy, two Monophysite bodies (the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church of America and the Assyrian Orthodox Church), the "Nestorian" Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church of the East, and the Roman Catholic Uniat Churches! — In any work so encyclopedic, mistakes will occur; thus, for example, on p. 129 the date of the Formula of Concord is given as 1580 instead of 1577; on p. 130 the date of the founding of the New Amsterdam Lutheran congregation is given as 1648 instead of 1649; and the year the English took control of "New York" is given as 1644 instead of 1664.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

DIE ABENDLAENDISCHE SENDUNG DER OESTLICH-ORTHO-DOXEN KIRCHE: DIE RUSSISCHE KIRCHE UND DAS ABENDLAENDISCHE CHRISTENTUM IM ZEITALTER DER HEILIGEN ALLIANZ. By Ernst Benz. Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, 1950. 294 pages, and 17 full-page illustrations. Paper. Price not given.

Franz Xaver von Baader (1765—1841) was a Bavarian polymath who is remembered a century after his death as a distinguished mining engineer, as an original — though unorthodox and unsystematic — mystical philosopher, and as one of modern Roman Catholicism's greatest speculative theologians, who was compelled to resign from his professorship because he was a layman. In addition, he was passionately devoted to the ideal of Christian reunion. Despite his affiliation with the Roman Catholic Church, he was imbued with the ecumenical ideas that marked the era after the defeat of Napoleon and that crisscrossed denominational lines. Noteworthy was his conviction not only that Eastern Orthodoxy deserved to be heard as a *tertia pars* in addition to Roman Catholicism and

Evangelical Christianity, but also that Eastern Orthodoxy had a historic mission to fulfill as the mediator between the other two segments of Christendom. Supplementing the existing materials with the important collection of Baader's letters published by Eugène Susini in 1942, Benz here patiently reconstructs Baader's relations with Prince Alexander Nikolayevich Golitsyn, the Russian minister of cultus under Tsar Alexander I, the fantastic story of Baader's ill-starred trip to Russia and his ecumenical projects during the reign of Tsar Nicholas I. Under the last head Benz evaluates Baader's position over against his own church as well as over against Orthodoxy, notably as illustrated in what Benz calls "the greatest ecumenical work of the nineteenth century," Baader's *Der morgenländische und abendländische Katholizismus*. Although this is basically a highly specialized monograph (and although Benz's enthusiasm may be exaggerating Baader's significance slightly), it will furnish instructive insights to any reader interested in Eastern Orthodoxy, the ecumenical movement, the history of Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century, or the history of Roman Catholicism during the same period. Bibliography, illustrations, and index are first rate.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

PATRISTIC HOMILIES ON THE GOSPELS, ed. M. F. Toal. Vol. I:

From the First Sunday of Advent to Quinquagesima. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955. xiii and 503 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

While the editor-translator of this series—ultimately, it is hoped, to comprise four volumes—has had as his purpose to aid his fellow Roman Catholic priests "in the sacred ministry of preaching," he has with even this first volume placed deeply in his debt every English-speaking denomination which regards itself as an extension of the ancient and purer church, as our Symbols call the church of the orthodox Fathers. His method, Sunday by Sunday, is to reproduce the Gospel for the day (according to the modern Roman rite, which has suffered some dislocations in comparison with the older pericopal system in use among us), with the parallel Gospels printed out in full. Next he reproduces in English the exposition of the Gospel from the *Catena aurea* of the Angelic Doctor, followed by several complete homilies on the text by various Fathers, and, finally, by brief notes devoted mainly to the identification of quotations from the Sacred Scriptures, indication of the original sources, and an evaluation of the authenticity of a particular homily where this has been called into question. Each Sunday thus averages out at around 28 pages of stimulating and often highly quotable material. Taking the Second Sunday after the Epiphany by way of example: The *Catena aurea* (7 pages) quotes extensive paragraphs from the works (mainly commentaries and homilies) of St. John Chrysostom, St. Bede the Venerable, St. Augustine, St. Hilary, and Alcuin. The appended homilies are by St. John Chrysostom, one on the words "Mine hour is

not yet come" (5 pages), and another on "The First Miracle" (2 pages); by the famed fifth-century preacher St. Gaudentius of Brescia on "Christian Life" (5 pages); by St. Augustine on "Christ in His Mystical Body" (3 pages); by St. Cyril on St. John 2:1-11 (3 pages); and by St. Bernard, one on "The Six Watering Pots" (3 pages) and another on "The Spiritual Nuptials of the Gospel" (5 pages). Whether for private preparatory meditation, for "pump priming," for exegetical study of the text, or for understanding the systematic implications of the passage, these materials are of vast value. Properly used they can give preaching a depth that it cannot acquire as easily in any other way.—At least two fervent statements on preaching in this book will strike responsive chords. One is by Dominican Father Michael Browne in the Foreword: "This apostolic ministry [of preaching] is one on which all else depends in the mission of the Church for the salvation of souls." The other is the editor-translator's own in the Preface: "The supreme mission imposed by Christ on His Apostles was to preach the Gospel to every creature. In virtue of this mission, they to whom the command was given, and those to whom it descends, speak with authority and power in the things of God: the power being in the word given them. And this alone do men wish to hear from those so commanded: the word of God in the Gospel of Christ. It is now their birthright: that wherein they hope, the source of faith, the bond of charity."—It is devoutly to be hoped that the Irish and American publishers will make the succeeding volumes of the series available at an early date.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

A SELECT LIBRARY OF NICENE AND POST-NICENE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH: SECOND SERIES, eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Volume XII: *The Letters and Sermons of Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome*, trans. Charles Lett Feltoe, and *The Book of Pastoral Rule and Selected Epistles (Books I—VIII) of Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome*, trans. James Barmby; xlvii and 467 pages. Volume XIII: *Selected Epistles (Books VIII—XIV) of Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome*, trans. James Barmby, and *Selections from the Hymns and Homilies of Ephraim the Syrian and from the Demonstrations of Aphrahat the Persian Sage*, ed. John Gwynn; ix and 433 pages. Volume XIV: *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church, Their Canons and Dogmatic Decrees*, ed. Henry R. Percival; xxxv and 671 pages. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956. Cloth. \$6.00 a volume.

With these three volumes the reissue of the Second Series of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* is completed. With the ten volumes of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* already available, there remain to be reprinted only the eight volumes of St. Augustine and the six volumes of St. John Chrysostom that comprise the First Series of *The Post-Nicene Fathers*. Volume XII

makes available a good brief *vita* of St. Leo the Great, a good portion of the 173 letters that have survived out of his correspondence (including all but one of those cited in the Catalog of Testimonies), and approximately half of his sermons (including both of those cited in the Formula of Concord and the Catalog of Testimonies). For St. Gregory the Great we have by way of introduction a good introductory statement of the political and ecclesiastical state of Europe and Africa at the time and a brief biographical sketch, followed by the famed *Liber regulae pastoralis* (written in the great tradition of St. Gregory of Nazianzen's *Second Oration* and St. John Chrysostom's *De sacerdotio*) on the duties of preaching and the spiritual guidance of Christians, plus a generous selection of his most important letters from the first eight books of the *Registrum* (covering the years 590—598). Volume XIII contains additional letters from the remaining six books of the *Registrum*; between the two volumes all but one of the citations from St. Gregory in the *Book of Concord* and the Catalog of Testimonies are reproduced. The balance of the volume offers representative material from two great fourth-century Fathers of the Syrian Church, St. Ephrem and his contemporary, St. Aphraates. Over forty pages of introductory material are followed by literal prose versions of four sets of his hymns — the so-called "Nisibene Hymns," translated by J. T. Sarsfield Stopford, the nineteen Hymns on the Nativity, translated by J. B. Morris and A. Edward Johnston, the fifteen Hymns for the Feast of the Epiphany, translated by Johnston, and the seven Hymns on the Faith, called "The Pearl," translated by Morris — and his homilies on our Lord, on admonition and repentance, and on the sinful woman of Luke 7. St. Aphraates is represented by eight of his "Demonstrations" (we should probably call them instructions) — of faith, of wars, of monks, of the resurrection of the dead, of pastors, of Christ, the Son of God, of persecution, and of death and eschatology. The concluding volume is a gold mine of information on the Seven Ecumenical Councils (and the subecumenical Quinisext Council), their canons and decrees, supplemented with scores of "excursus" on everything from the rise of the patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Communion of sick to usury and the marriage of the clergy. In addition, there are reproduced, with scholarly annotations, the canons of the local synods that received church-wide acceptance through the Ecumenical Councils — Ancyra (314), Neocaesarea (315), Gangra (4th century), Antioch "in Encaeniis" (341), Laodicaea (4th century), Sardica (ca. 343), Carthage (419), Constantinople (394), and Carthage (257). An Appendix contains a dozen selections of canons and rulings not having conciliar origin, but approved by name in the Quinisext Council, from the "Apostolic Canons" to the Encyclical of the Byzantine Patriarch Gennadius. The usual splendid indices make for easy reference.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

HEAVEN AND HELL: A PRESENT-DAY CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION. By John Sutherland Bonnell. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 62 pages. Cloth. \$1.00.

Here are five textless, illustration-packed sermons on eschatology by the minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church. He affirms his faith in personal immortality, because humanity has an instinct for immortality, because man's moral and spiritual endowments require eternity for their perfection, and because the essential worth of man and God's concern for him demand faith in eternal life. As far as heaven is concerned, personal identity survives the experience of death, the "rest" of heaven is not passivity and indolence ("there will be little children waiting to be taught, the weak and faltering needing a helping hand, and poor backward souls hungering to hear 'the old, old story of Jesus and His love'"), nor will its rewards involve monotonous uniformity or commonplace equality. With reference to hell, neither the doctrine of everlasting torment nor that of universalism nor that of conditional immortality "has the right to demand our exclusive allegiance." As far as recognition after death is concerned, it is probable. As far as the resurrection of Christ is concerned, He is not in the cold tomb "with the graveclothes and the habiliments of death. He is risen. From henceforth he is living in the hearts of men and women who will receive Him."

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

BILLY SUNDAY WAS HIS REAL NAME. By William G. McLoughlin, Jr. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955. xxix and 325 pages. Cloth. \$5.50.

The author—whose doctoral dissertation at Harvard in 1953 dealt with professional evangelism—presents his present volume as "a combination of biography and social history" (p. 311). The man Billy Sunday, the tradition of revivalism, and the age in which he lived and worked are the three ingredients of the book. The author rejects the psychological as well as the sociological explanation for the phenomenon called revivalism; he rejects, too, the theological or providential explanation of its occurrence. "It is the purpose of this book," he states, "to show that Billy Sunday's career, considered as a whole, represents a significant religious movement in America which cannot be measured in terms either of mob psychology or of declension and growth of church membership. Furthermore, this book tries to demonstrate that this religious movement was essentially different from the other major revival movements in our history . . . to see it in terms of a critical reorientation in the ideological structure of American life. . . . To understand Sunday's revivalism is to understand better the era in which he lived." (Pp. viii f.) The author has achieved his purposes.

Sunday's career as an evangelist began in 1895; in the decade between 1908 and 1918 he was at the peak of success. He had a staff of 23 mem-

bers in 1918, an increase of 20 over the three he had in 1900. Professional evangelism, the author shows, was a well-organized venture. Sunday's formula relied on a time-tested system which involved "the advance man, the chorister, the guarantee fund, the businessmen backers, the precampaign publicity and committee organization, the wooden tabernacle with sawdust floor, the spectacular arrival and opening night, the paid specialists, the delegation system, the trail hitting, the society parlor meetings, the collection for expenses, the buildup for the freewill offering" (p. 262). After 1918 Sunday's popularity started to decline, although he continued active until his death in 1935.

Sunday is described as "a literalistic conservative in his theology" (p. 121). He taught: "With Christ you are saved; without Him you are lost" (p. 123). He believed in the existence of heaven and hell and the devil. He preached the imminent bodily second coming of Christ. Conversion meant to him the completion of man's part of a bargain with God and the acknowledgment of the good life as the way of life. He did not preach the social gospel, but "progressive orthodoxy." He wanted to make "a fighting saint" out of the sinner. He became the champion of national Prohibition. His morality, generally speaking, was the morality of middle-class America.

Even H. L. Mencken spoke of his personal charm. Orator and demagogue, acrobat and actor, leader and friend, Billy Sunday had a tremendous appeal in his day. At the same time, his sermons—"disconnected, irrelevant fragments of thought, strung together by invectives, recriminations, quaint stories, and punctuated always by a jumble of acrobatics" (p. 186)—are not cited as models by professors of homiletics. And despite the headlines the campaigns of Sunday in the long run were not really successful.

CARL S. MEYER

THE BEGINNINGS OF UNITARIANISM IN AMERICA. By Conrad Wright. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1954. ix and 305 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

This book received the 1954 award of the Carnegie Revolving Fund, administered by the American Historical Association. Its author teaches church history at the Harvard Divinity School. Begun as a doctoral dissertation at Harvard under the direction of Perry Miller, it traces the liberal movement within the Congregational churches of New England between 1735 and 1805. After the latter date, this liberal movement emerged as Unitarianism.

Arminianism, supernatural rationalism, and anti-Trinitarianism were the three doctrinal planks in the liberal platform. Charles Chauncey and Jonathan Mayhew were the leaders of these liberals. Jonathan Edwards (at least before 1758) opposed them, as did Samuel Hopkins and other "New Divinity" men. Traditional Calvinism, of course, and the Covenant

Theology of the Puritans were undermined. The social structure and the influence of Harvard had their part in the emergence of liberalism.

The doctrine of original sin was the first doctrine attacked. The question of the freedom of the will followed. Then the doctrine of justification by faith was perverted; "there gradually developed the concept of justification as a standard to attain, rather than a specific act of God in pardoning individuals" (p. 122). Supernatural rationalism (to be distinguished from deism) allowed for revelation and miracles. "The Benevolence of the Deity" is called "the great discovery of the Arminians" (p. 184). This discovery, the author says, brought them to universalism, as opposed to the particularism of Calvinism, but they refused to make it the central theme of their preaching. The author concludes that, even though there was no inevitable connection between Arminianism and anti-Trinitarianism, "temperamentally and historically they went together" (p. 200). Arianism, not Socinianism, was embraced by these liberals.

The author also discusses the Great Awakening (1734—1745), the right of private judgment, the threat of infidelity posed by Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason* (1794), and the election of Henry Ware as Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard.

The developments in theology in New England during the last two generations of the eighteenth century are traced authoritatively in this study. Here, too, is one answer to the question, How does liberalism in theology grow?

CARL S. MEYER

THE CHRISTIAN IMPERATIVE. By Max Warren. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955. 141 pages, plus indexes of authors and Biblical references. Cloth. \$3.00.

Canon Warren has been a lay missionary to Nigeria, a curate and vicar in the Anglican Church, and a secretary in enterprises for youth work and missions. An earlier book, *The Christian Mission* (London: SCM Press, 1951), traverses some of the same ground as the present volume, which comprises lectures given at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass. He defines the imperative as the compulsion, born of the discovery that God gave Christ for the world, that Christ gave Himself for the church and that the individual lives his life by faith in Christ. His chapters bear the titles "Go Preach," "Go Teach," "Go Heal," "Go Baptize," and "The 'How' of Obedience." Considerable Biblical reference underlies the first chapters, supplemented by pungent observations on special areas of foreign missions. The author views the purpose of healing as involving the total individual, the wholeness of the community, and the wholeness of the church. Interesting is his discussion of the baptism of Jesus, wherein he follows the thinking of Oscar Cullmann. The closing chapter discusses the commitment of love which is necessary to obey the mandate and undertake the imperative. This implies that every Christian is a missionary and should participate also in the foreign mission where his calling takes him to foreign lands.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

COME, FOLLOW ME! By Waldo J. Werning. St. Louis: Printed for the Author (6457 Lansdowne Ave.), 1956. 20 pages. Paper. 25 cents.

This booklet contains practical information and suggestions for new church members. Its purpose is stated in a word of welcome:

Your pastor and the members of this congregation wish to assist you to grow in faith and good works. There are ways, however, in which you can help yourself. This booklet tells you briefly what you may expect from the church and what the church expects of you. Its message offers you encouragement to fulfill the spiritual hopes which are in your heart at this time. It also brings information about the work of the church and some practical suggestions for participation. This booklet is given you with the prayer that it may prove helpful to you in your decision to "follow Jesus" and in making the most of your church membership.

The new church member will certainly appreciate this manual. Many pastors will want it to give to the newly confirmed. HENRY G. COINER

CHURCH AND STATE THROUGH THE CENTURIES, eds. Sidney Z. Ehler and John B. Morrall. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1954. xiv and 625 pages. Cloth. \$6.75.

Church and state relations continue to be a vexing and vital problem in contemporary life in the United States as well as elsewhere. Neither our Federal Constitution nor our Lord's directive to "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's" can function as a bill of specifications with regard to all details of church-state relationships. Can casuistry draw a precise line between spiritual and temporal authorities? Will not changing circumstances in every age necessitate modifications? What is history's answer?

This volume is a boon for students both of political philosophy and of history. It is an anthology of primary and official documents, in good English translation, which reflect the leading decisions made since about A.D. 100 at crucial moments in the evolution of the mutual relation between church and state.

Divided into eight sections or chapters dealing with as many historical periods, this book presents 79 documents, the first of which is Trajan's Letter to Pliny, and the last the Communist Czechoslovak Law on Church Affairs, 1949. Each section is preceded by an excellent summary of the characteristics of the period under consideration, and each document in turn has a short introduction explaining its origin, significance, and consequences.

The authors are associated with University College, Dublin. Their purpose in preparing this compilation was not to evaluate decisions made and actions taken in the course of history, but to offer a "documentary record of the success or failure of church polity in the art of state craft." Their book is remarkably free from the prejudices of controversy. They succeeded admirably in keeping the intrusion of personal opinion to a minimum and in allowing the documents to speak for themselves.

A. G. MERKENS

ADVENTURES IN CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP. By R. C. Rein. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955. 100 pages. Paper. \$1.00.

Surely this is a most valuable and timely contribution which every pastor will deeply appreciate.

It may be described as a manual on Christian stewardship which starts with Christ—and stays with Him. Its theology is thoroughly Christian, written in plain and winsome language. Eight study topics lend themselves for use in Bible institutes, seminars, stewardship schools, Bible classes, and for private and family study. These topics are intensely practical, adding up to a most complete and solid treatment of the basic essentials and scope of Christian stewardship.

Questions for discussion with Scripture references and assignments for further consideration follow each chapter, making this a very sharp and useful tool.

HARRY G. COINER

THAT REMINDS ME. By W. F. Weiherman. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, c. 1955. 129 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

"Chief" W. F. Weiherman deserves recognition in a theological journal as one of the church's great leaders in the care of its youth and in the development of a theology of the practical Christian life. This little book reflects some of the keynotes which he has sounded through the years and is garnished with many of the witticisms for which "Chief" is famous.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

THE ROSARY: ITS HISTORY AND MEANING (*Geschichte und Gebetsschule des Rosenkranzes*). By Franz Michel Willam. Translated by Edwin Kaiser. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1953. 216 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

This volume gives an interesting and readable account of the development of the rosary as a form of devotion which combines meditation upon the "mysteries" with the vocal words of the prayers. It defends the rosary and other "nonliturgical" forms of Roman piety at a time when the liturgical movement in the Latin Church is stressing the supreme importance of the active participation of the laity in the sacrifice of the Mass.

Willam asserts that the rosary was not used in any form in the church during the first thousand years of Christian history (p. 4). The Hail Mary, even in its "short form" (that is, without the closing invocation, "Holy Mary, Mother of God, etc.") was not used until the thirteenth century (p. 21). The rosary is not found in its present "dialog" form before the sixteenth century (p. 82). It is abundantly clear from this book that the most objectionable features of the rosary devotion are comparatively late additions to the earlier forms which apostrophized rather than petitioned the Mother of our Lord. There is a very brief

section on non-Christian use of forms of prayer similar to the rosary (pp. 182—184).

The author's own evaluation of the rosary is that it occupies "middle ground" between the highest and simpler forms of prayer (p. 123). He makes it clear that the rosary is a new type of prayer in the church—the creation of a specific type of medieval piety.

A concluding section, entitled "Reference and Comment," lists the known original sources and published works which give information concerning the history and meaning of the rosary. Not every pastor's library needs this book, but it will be of value for any Lutheran who seeks to understand Roman forms of prayer.

JAMES G. MANZ

THE SURVIVAL OF THE HISTORIC VESTMENTS IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AFTER 1555. By Arthur Carl Piepkorn. St. Louis: The School for Graduate Studies of Concordia Seminary, 1956. 123 pages. Paper. \$2.00.

This is a "graduate study" published by the School for Graduate Studies of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, the first in a projected series of comprehensive and scholarly research monographs. The author is professor of systematic theology at the above seminary and has long been active in studies in liturgics. His purpose in the present study is to sort out in the "folk-lore about vestments" the "hard core of demonstrable fact," track down misleading statements, present available information in chronological sequence, and particularly "consider what historic warrant and justification the combinations of stole-and-surplice and stole-and-gown may possess as normal Lutheran service vesture." The study regards "cassock, gown, biretta, scarf, ruff, bands, and black cape" not as service vestments but as part of the domestic and street garb of the clergy originally and does not discuss them. The author distinguishes four attitudes toward the ancient vestments; (1) that they are to be rejected in favor of a plain black gown; (2) that a white alb or surplice is permissible, but Eucharistic vestments are not; (3) that all vestments are things indifferent (the position of Luther and Bugenhagen); (4) that vestments are things indifferent, but that the retention of some or all is desirable "as a symbol of the unbroken continuity of the Church of the Augsburg Confession with her Catholic past and as a witness against the enthusiasts, Sacramentarians, and other radical reformers" (p. 9). Prodigious detailed accounts are supplied of the situation in German, Slovak, Hungarian, Scandinavian, American, and Asiatic churches, by centuries, beginning with the sixteenth. Illustrations of close study are the judgments on Toffeen's version of the Swedish Bishops' Agreement of 1583 (pp. 19 and 28), on Sachse's report of the ordination of Justus Falckner in Philadelphia in 1703 (pp. 59—62, 76, 77), and on Drews's reports of the use of the stole in Saxony in the early 19th century (p. 87). Piepkorn's conclusions are that the alb, cincture, surplice, and chasuble "have never

passed wholly out of use" in the various churches of the Augsburg Confession. Cope and amice have persisted in modified use and form. The mitre, maniple, dalmatic, and stole passed out of general use; "where these vestments are currently in use in the Church of the Augsburg Confession, they are restorations, not survivals" (p. 119). "Authentic Lutheranism" did not historically reject service vestments; some of the most orthodox teachers of the church defended their use.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: SHORT DIVERSIONS ON RELIGIOUS THEMES. By Halford E. Luccock. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. 191 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

The author warns that these short pieces "start, but they do not finish." Both their starting and their stopping are peculiarly helpful. Dr. Luccock suggests a situation or develops a contrast that does start your imagination moving. His stopping is equally helpful—you will know the satisfaction of working out the idea for yourself. If the result is to be a sermon, it is to be hoped that these items will not tend to become texts. The preacher's mind should move at once for the passages in which God comments on the subject. This material will then move down into its proper place as support and illustrative material for a good sermon.

GEORGE W. HOYER

NO WINGS IN THE MANSE. By Betty Frist. Westwood: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1956. 159 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

HOW TO BE A PREACHER'S WIFE AND LIKE IT. By Lora Lee Parrott. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House. 120 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

Mrs. Frist's autobiographical sketch is crowded with anecdote and provides witty, yet respectful glimpses of parsonage life from the point of view of child and parent. She has been on the staff of Presbyterian churches and groups.

Mrs. Parrott, who has previously published several volumes of recipes from parsonages, presents a condensed but quite comprehensive manual for the pastor's wife. She has had journalistic experience.

Both women are products of parsonages and wives of pastors.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

RUSSIAN ICONS. By Philipp Schweinfurth. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953. 61 pages, including fourteen full-page plates in color and twelve in black and white. Boards. \$6.50.

The value of this volume—first of a new series of the handsome "Iris Books" edited by Hans Zbinden—lies in the beautifully reproduced, individually tipped-in illustrations and in the quality rather than the

quantity of Schweinfurth's succinct and scholarly introduction and plate-by-plate iconographic commentary. In point of time the examples range from the eleventh (or twelfth) century icon of Our Lady of Vladimir to the seventeenth-century Central Russian "Death of the Virgin" from the Hann Collection in Pittsburgh. Whether the reader is a connoisseur of this characteristically Eastern art form or someone who is venturing for the first time into a realm of religious expression radically different from what we are accustomed to in the West, the time he spends with this superbly designed and executed book will be richly rewarding.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

THE CHURCH AND THE PUBLIC CONSCIENCE. By Edgar M. Carlson. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1956. 104 pages. \$1.75.

The author is known for his *The Reinterpretation of Luther* and his competence especially in contemporary Swedish Lutheran theology. In this volume he directs these and other insights to the vexing problem of the church's duty toward the citizenship of its members and toward the state and community in which it lives. He respects government as a structure of society under God and applies to it Luther's thinking on the calling. His judgments concerning Billing and Wingren are healthy, as is his suspicion of the objectivity of a natural law. In the spirit of Aulén he accords more scope to the church in its obligation to preach the Law to government and community than is customary in this reviewer's tradition, but his reasoning is sound, his accent on the internal conflict within the church between flesh and Spirit realistic, and the style with which he sets forth the relation between the Christian hope and the Christian task is glowing and moving.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

POWER TO MANAGE YOURSELF. By Harold Blake Walker. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 232 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

The author, a former journalist, is now a highly successful preacher. One is tempted to say that this volume reports in the flavor of the syndicated column on the subject of mental adjustment rather than digs down for a theologically correct insight into the problems of self-management.

K. H. BREIMEIER

HOW TO OVERCOME NERVOUS TENSION AND SPEAK WELL IN PUBLIC. By Alfred Tack. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison and Co., 1955. 242 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Alfred Tack is best known as the director of a successful public speaking school. This book presents his tested formula for overcoming tension and speaking effectively in public. The "minute technique" for relaxing is simple and easy to master, but it must become habitual. While a large portion of the book deals with the step-by-step writing of a speech, it is generously interspersed with timely and refreshing instructions for delivery.

Instead of being padded with pages of anecdotes, witticisms, and extracts from lengthy orations, the book on every page contains a lesson that will stimulate and at the same time teach the right way to speak in public.

JOHN C. PFITZER

UNCOMMON PRAYERS. Collected by Cecil Hunt, ed. John Wallace Suter. Greenwich: The Seabury Press, 1955. 182 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

The prayers of this collection are distinguished by their beauty of thought and content. They reveal, too, that beauty need not suffer by being coupled with symmetry and form. Many of the prayers are familiar; some are passages from Holy Scriptures, notably from the Psalter, and some are hymns. We were disappointed to discover that too small a proportion makes any mention of our Lord or of the Holy Trinity; not a few might well be spoken by pagans (in fact, several were penned by Unitarians and pagans). No prayers by Lutherans have been included. Noted divines of certain Protestant denominations were slighted as well.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

BEGINNING AT HOME. By Mary Perkins. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1955. 158 pages. Cloth, boxed. Price not given.

A beautifully printed, interestingly presented manual on the development of really Christian homes. Study questions and discussion topics follow each chapter. Its goal is thus stated: "We should try to train the children to make the thoughts and words and actions of daily life the signs of their love of God, able to be offered with our Lord's sacrifice in the Mass." The very practical discussions for accomplishing the first half of that sentence in the text are colored by the Roman stress contained in the sentence's last half.

GEORGE W. HOYER

THE HISTORICAL JESUS. By Leroy Waterman. New York: Exposition Press, 1955. 148 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

The author is the octogenarian professor emeritus of Semitics at the University of Michigan. His book is a frank and forthright plea for a this-worldly Gospel, for a belief in the Jesus of history, a return "to him" and not "of him." The method is to trace the bankruptcy of apocalyptic, which is variously styled "wishful thinking," a "mirage," a "deep-seated delusion," from the Old Testament through the intertestamental period to the New Testament and the modern age.

Although the author is manifestly an expert in the field of Jewish and apocryphal apocalyptic, there are certain basic convictions that color his scholarship even there. These are a denial of any valid concept of the "chosen people" and the Messiah, a refusal to treat revelation as other than experiential, a failure to view sacred history *sub specie aeternitatis*. For the Old Testament this involves a supreme reliance upon the prophets

of the 8th century and a thoroughly negative criticism of not only Daniel but the post-Exilic prophets. Indeed in these books the author sees the outstanding examples of false prophecy in the Old Testament.

Much of the New Testament is a hopelessly contradictory book for Professor Waterman. The optimistic apocalyptic hope of the earlier disciples in a Messianic reign on earth is mingled with the pessimistic apocalyptic of St. Paul and his view of the final Judgment. But the greatest and saddest error was that "they committed the founder of their faith to their own and opposing views" (p. 70). Much of the latter section of the book is an indictment of historic Christianity for perpetuating the deep-seated delusion of apocalyptic and losing touch with the historical personality of its founder.

Only the teachings of Jesus, the author feels, are the hope of the world, and we arrive at that basic ethic of love by stripping away the bankrupt and contradictory apocalyptic. On the one hand, the author seems to deny that we can know what Jesus really taught, but then again the author is quite certain that the patient historical critic can penetrate behind the Gospels to the sure fact that Jesus not only did not claim to be the Messiah but also sought to dissuade the disciples from such a false hope. In a sense we have here the skepticism of Bultmann enclosed in a liberal faith. One cannot help feel that Waterman's error begins at the cross.

Although most Christians will reject not only Waterman's conclusions but also many of his supporting arguments, nevertheless we must admit that historic Christianity has not always carried out the will of Jesus Christ in this world. For this sin judgment continually begins at the house of God. Moreover at a time like ours when there are many tendencies also in theology toward an unbiblical pessimism and an over-emphasis of eschatology torn from its rootage in Christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology, this book may be a useful corrective. The church can learn, howbeit negatively and sometimes positively, even from extremists and errorists.

HENRY W. REIMANN

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of a book in this list acknowledges its receipt and does not preclude further discussion of its contents in the "Book Review" section.)

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ. By Geoffrey Graystone. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. 117 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

Science, Democracy and Islam and Other Essays. By Humayun Kabir. New York: The Macmillan Company (London: George Allen and Unwin), 1956. 126 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

The Call of the Cloister: Religious Communities and Kindred Bodies in the Anglican Communion. By Peter F. Anson. New York: The Macmillan Company (London: SPCK), 1955. xvi + 641 pages. Cloth. \$8.50.

Maria oder Christus? By Otto Semmelroth. Frankfurt: Verlag Josef Knecht, 1954. 159 pages. Cloth. DM 5.80.

Das Mariengrab. By Clemens Kopp. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1955. 46 pages. Paper. DM 1.50.

Das Geheimnis der Jungfrau-Mutter Maria nach dem Kirchenvater Ambrosius. By Josef Huhn. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1956. 289 pages. Paper. DM 12.50.

Ich bin euer Tröster: Rundfunkpredigten. By Hans Rottmann. Porto Alegre: Casa Publicadora Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), 1956. 287 pages. Cloth. \$2.80.

The Writings of James Arminius. Translated from the Latin by James Nichols and W. R. Bagnell. Volume I; 669 pages. Volume II; 538 pages. Volume III; 570 pages. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. Cloth. \$17.50 for the set.

Rediscovering the Words of Faith. By Charles T. Sardeson. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 128 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

Missionary Health Manual. By Paul E. Adolph. Chicago: Moody Press, 1954. 141 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

Glory Awaits Me. By William Gouloze. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. 112 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

A New Apologetics: An Analysis and Appraisal of the Eristic Theology of Emil Brunner. By Paul G. Schrottenboer. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1955. 224 pages. Paper. 5.90 Dutch guilders.

Christian Perfection and American Methodism. By John Leland Peters. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 252 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

Schriften des Theologischen Konvents Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses, Volume 9. By Peter Brunner, Wilhelm Maurer, Ernst Kinder, and Friedrich Karl Schumann. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1955. 136 pages. Paper. DM 10.40.

Der Symbolbegriff in der neueren Religionsphilosophie und Theologie. By Hans Looft. Cologne: Kölner Universitäts-Verlag, 1955. 208 pages. Paper. DM 14.00.

Die christliche Bildmeditation. By Alfons Rosenberg. München-Planegg: Otto-Wilhelm-Barth-Verlag, 1955. 302 pages. Cloth. DM 16.80.

Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk. 22:19, 20. By Heinz Schürmann. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955. xii + 154 pages. Paper. DM 10.80.

Christus und Maria: Dogmatische Grundlagen der Marianischen Frömmigkeit. By Herman Volk. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1955. 27 pages. Paper. DM 1.50.

Tägliche Andachten (Vol. XIX, No. 141: July 28 to September 18, 1956). By Otto Nieting. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 64 pages. Paper. 10 cents.